

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

DECEMBER, 1853.

ART. I.—1. *The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice; or, a Defence of the Catholic Doctrine that Holy Scripture has been, since the Times of the Apostles, the sole Divine Rule of Faith and Practice to the Church.* By WILLIAM GOODE, M.A. Three vols. 8vo., Second Edition, revised and enlarged. London, Jackson, 1853.

2. *The Church of Rome: her Present Moral Theology, Scriptural Instruction, and Canon Law.* A Report of the Books and Documents on the Papacy, deposited in the University Library, Cambridge, the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.
3. *Truth spoken in Love, or Romanism and Tractarianism refuted by the Word of God.* By the REV. H. H. BEAMISH, M. A., Minister of Trinity Chapel, Conduit Street. London, John F. Shaw, Southampton Row and Paternoster Row.
4. *Apocalyptic Sketches.* By the REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. London, Arthur Hall, Virtue and Co., Paternoster Row.
5. *The Evidence of Scripture against the Divines of the Roman Church.* By the REV. SANDERSON ROBINS, M.A. London, Longmans.
6. *The Finger of God.* By the REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. London, Arthur Hall, Virtue, and Co., Paternoster Row.
7. *The Counter Theory.* London, J. H. Parker.

TO criticise each of the above-named works in detail, would be labour lost. The faster the heads of the hydra are pruned away, the more abundantly they will sprout. If people really believe that the Church is a mysterious union of contradictory enormities, the marvel is not that they should dislike her as much as they do, but that they should not abhor her yet more. Yet, as the salvation of souls innumerable must depend on the truth or falsehood

of such views—views often very hastily adopted—it may be well to point out the one fundamental error upon which they are all based, and the one criterion by which they may all alike be refuted. Our object is to point out to such of our Protestant friends as have a real reverence for Truth, and a becoming sense of the gravity of the matters at issue between the Church and the Sects, that no conceivable multiplication of books, such as constitute the popular literature of Protestantism,—no accumulation of learning, such as that which Mr. Goode, by far the ablest and most erudite, as well as most recent, defenders of its fundamental dogma has brought together—can assist us in discriminating between Truth and Falsehood. It is in vain to go on perpetually deducing the same conclusions from the same premises, if the real question is, whether the premises themselves be sound. It is in vain to go on perpetually weighing and measuring the same objects, unless we have previously ascertained that the weights and measures are themselves correct. If the very watchword of Protestantism be a falsehood, no multiplication of echoes, no gifts of ventriloquism, can convert it into a truth. The furious denunciation must take its leap in the dark, and perish like other blind and violent things. The ingenious theory must share the fate of theories, and melt into thin air. Even the deprecatory insinuation must die with the compliment in its mouth. The most magniloquent protest of nations, as of individuals, is worth just so much, and no more, as the fundamental principle on which it is founded; and if the rule of Private Judgment be not the right method for arriving at religious truth, Protestantism, however long it may last, must end at last like a schoolboy's "barring out." In the following pages we shall make some remarks, not of a learned, but of a popular character, on the Rule of Faith, with a view of proving that Private Judgment, in theological research, can derive no sanction whatever from common sense, practical judgment, or fact; and secondly, that through the Catholic rule alone is it possible to attain Christian truth in connection with those spiritual and vital effects of truth so ardently, and often so sincerely, sought by Protestants; but in the attainment of which, under purely Protestant circumstances, the enthusiast alone flatters himself that he is successful.

Protestantism has for three centuries had possession of

not a few countries abounding in arts, sciences, historic associations, genius, and industry. It has had many aids which it had no original claim to, including the institutions raised by Catholic piety for the maintenance of learning, and the increase of knowledge, the traditional habits of races disposed to correct the aberrations of the head by the wisdom of heart, and to retain as much of their inherited religion as was not absolutely incompatible with their new principles of investigation; and, above all, it has possessed the great standard of orthodoxy held aloft by the *Orbis Terrarum*, and in part by the Greek Church, which though wholly unswayed by Papal influence, attested in its separated state, far the larger portion of the Roman Catholic theology. Yet, with these aids, as well as its own resources, including State-patronage, the sanction of public opinion, a general sway over literature, unexpected sources of information, and aids to criticism, it has utterly failed to produce a theology. To deny this failure would be as disingenuous as to affirm that Protestantism is inconsistent with liberal institutions, or with industrial progress. Let disputants say what they please; common sense can judge of facts, though not of doctrines; and the world knows by this time both what the Protestant principle can do, and what it cannot. Those who most respect it value it on the ground of its favouring freedom of thought, rather than of its embodying, in any consistent form, the results of profound thought on the subject most worthy of thought. Many admire it also because it sustains a perpetual protest against what they deem the tyranny and imposture of Rome. That protest is constant; and this may, or not, be an excellence; but its theological form varies perpetually, and is reduced to turn its variations into a boast. "Motley is the only wear," is a position which pleases more than would avow it.

No one can look at the Protestant map of the world without observing that Protestantism has not only failed to build, but alas, to preserve. It bequeaths less than it inherited, and its patrimony daily wastes. Many sacred principles were clung to by the early Reformers, in which their descendants no more believe than in the "traditions" rejected by them. Most of the first Reformers contended for orthodoxy on the Trinity and the Incarnation, and at least professed to hold, on those abysmal subjects, the

faith of the first four Councils. To how many would not the decrees of those councils now seem needless subtleties, or contentious dogmatism? On the subject of the two chief Sacraments the belief of the many has become attenuated, and in countless cases all definite belief has vanished. The "opus operatum" of the Sacraments was denounced in the 16th century; in the 19th how many believe that Prayer derives its efficacy from the reaction of the mind on itself, and therefore that to pray for external blessings is unworthy! The ordinary belief of Protestants has likewise become much abridged, when compared with that of the first Reformers, on such subjects as Original Sin, the Evil Spirit, and Eternal Punishment. These things are trifling compared with other changes. As the Infallibility of the Church was in the 16th century denied, or reduced to an equivocation, so now the Divine inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture have met the same fate, to a very large extent, and in that land chiefly which was the stronghold and birthplace of the first Reformers. The "dogmatic principle," for which the early Reformers were willing alike to persecute, or to undergo persecution, is itself trembling in the balance; and the pious too often endeavour to persuade themselves that, in discarding it, religion will flourish all the more as a Sentiment and a Worship when it has thrown off its burthen. Not only many of the objects of faith are believed in no more, but Faith itself stands shorn of its divine attributes, and degenerates into Opinion. The very essence of divine knowledge has admitted the taint; and supernatural things no longer need, as many maintain, to be believed with a supernatural certainty. In the new language of the day, faith means acquiescence without certainty, not spiritual certainty without scientific demonstration. Change follows change unperceived, because names remain unchanged, and because relative position is still retained; yet the clear-sighted see plainly enough that the question at stake is, not contending versions of Christianity, or even Christianity itself, but religion, as distinguished from philosophy, and Theism itself *as religion*.

That there are revivals here and there proves no more than that the struggle is not yet over:—the tide goes out, though each successive wave comes in. That some Protestant countries retain more of orthodoxy than others, is also irrelevant. Neither is there any question here re-

pecting such infidelity as exists either in Protestant or Roman Catholic countries, but which has grown up and maintains itself by the avowed repudiation of Protestant or Roman Catholic principles. In all communions Infidels may arise; for the human will is free to co-operate with grace, or to reject it. What the world observes, whether with approval or disapproval, is, that Protestantism, as a whole, when judged by its formularies, and by the public acts of those who claim the name, and vindicate the principle of Protestantism, represents a body of doctrine diminishing as centuries go by. It stands thus painfully contrasted with inductive science, which daily adds to its noble stores. In its doctrine, as a consistent body of theology, seems incapable of growing, or even of living;—like inert matter it becomes assimilated by foreign things, such as prevalent philosophies, or political influences. This circumstance cannot be accounted for by any lack either of industry or ability in its professors. On the contrary it has produced many men of genius, of learning, and of zeal. But these are the very men from whom it has received the severest shocks. They have founded sects for its destruction, not orders for its advancement.

We raise no question here with respect to many sublime functions commonly attributed to religion in all ages;—whether, for instance, it should rule nations, inspire arts, mould manners, foster sciences, nurse civil institutions. For twelve centuries it did these things: but these are distinct considerations. At least it will be admitted that religion has one function which it cannot abdicate, that of *witnessing for the truth*. If Protestantism fails to do this, the failure should be accounted for. The first question a philosophic inquirer would be disposed to ask himself is, whether the *method* which it adopted for the investigation of truth in the province of religion, was sound or unsound. An erroneous method would account at once for religion being neither able to advance nor to hold its own. We know why the ancients and the schoolmen made so little progress in physical science:—they pursued for the most part a false method. A method that belongs to one department of thought will not answer for another. Experiment will not suffice where syllogisms are required, nor deduction only where induction is needed. Intuitions will teach us nothing in political economy, though much in mathematics. The fine arts have a method of a

more imaginative order. Theology, or the science of supernatural and revealed truths, must likewise possess a method of its own; and it is probable, *à priori*, that any other method would prove barren, even if it did not create confusion also.

With some not very important differences of detail, the method originally adopted by Protestantism was that attributed to it as a great discovery, and known by the name of "private judgment." That was its Rule of Faith, put forward in opposition to the Rule of church authority. As the rule of faith is, so must the faith formed by that rule be. If the former be sound, it will lead us into truth just in proportion as we observe it; if it be unsound, it will lead us into error, and eventually so imprison us in a world of false associations, that truth itself, seen in a false perspective, must appear to us strange and uncomely. Accordingly, theologians, at both sides, affirm that the rule of faith is the true point at issue between Roman Catholics and Protestants. If this one point really determine all others, we can see at once how it is possible even for the simple to find a clue amid the labyrinth of controversy. How comes it, then, that in place of keeping to a question confessedly conclusive, Protestants so commonly throw aside the consideration of it, on the avowed ground that this or that doctrine in detail is repugnant to them?

No candid man will deny that there are circumstances which at least throw suspicion on the method of private judgment. First, It was obviously the only method which *could* have been adopted by men who had set themselves the task on which the Reformers had embarked. In early times not only the church, but the vast heretical bodies that contended with, or encamped outside it, commonly claimed to preserve from adulteration the faith they had received by inheritance. The point at issue was the authentic form of the tradition, as well as the authentic reading of Holy Scripture, and the decrees of councils. The Reformers, on the other hand, professed to rediscover a pure faith, which had been buried beneath the superstitions of a thousand years. No existing tradition testified for them. They were thus compelled to adopt their rule of faith, even though it involved the notion that Christ's promise to His Church had failed in whole or in part. Necessity knows no law. Secondly. An opposite rule, that of authority and tradition, had always been acknowledged not

only by the Roman Catholic Church, but by the eastern churches in separation. Thirdly, An opposite rule had been acknowledged in England and Germany ever since those countries had been Christian. Fourthly, So fundamental and radical a change ought, at least, not to have taken place, except after long deliberation ; whereas the principle of private judgment, (on which all depended,) was practically taken for granted, not adopted after investigation ; and inquiries upon other points of theology were consequently based on a giant *assumption*. In principle, nothing short of a general council could have sanctioned a change in a matter so all-important as the rule of faith ; in practice the action preceded the deliberation ; *nations and individuals isolated themselves first, and then found out texts to justify isolation*. Possibly a spiritual revolution could not have been otherwise effected ; but that a spiritual revolution was either necessary or lawful, rested itself on nothing but assumption. Fifthly, Private judgment, as any one living at the time of the Reformation must have perceived, *might*, at least, be no theological principle at all, and no real rule of faith, whether sound or unsound, but simply a technical term for a natural instinct, that of "doing every man what was right in his own eyes," and thus resolving religious society into anarchy. Sixthly, That it actually amounted to no more than this was at least suggested by the fact that the work of destruction, spoliation, and sacrilege, was vehemently advancing at the same moment as the new opinions, the cry of "private judgment" finding its echoes in the falling roofs of monasteries, hospitals, and churches. Seventhly, And also by the circumstance that, while the new principle, if true at all, implied such a sending forth of the Holy Spirit as might well nigh have made every man a prophet, as a matter of fact no such glorious change accompanied the new order of things. The princes who supported the Reformation were, in many cases, its opprobrium ; the nobles were too often marked by rapacity and profaneness, the chief clergy were not seldom found pandering to royal or popular passions, and the masses of the people were, by the confession of the Reforming leaders, *more* immoral and insubordinate than before the Reformation. Eighthly, The corruptions in the Church, when the Reformation broke out, were not as great as they had been at various preceding

periods, when a real reform was achieved without involving either schism, a change of faith, or a new rule of faith. Such were the reforms brought about by Hildebrand, and by the Orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic. Corruption of morals and individual wickedness, moreover, must always exist in the church, as we are repeatedly told by the apostles, and by our Lord, who, as if to preclude all error on this subject, chose a Judas to be one of His apostles. To meet such corruption the ordinary organization of the Church suffices: nor were its powers ever more vigorously put forth than by the great reforming Council of Trent. Ninthly, The corruptions in the church early in the sixteenth century were easily accounted for by the constant tendency of charity to wax cold, the overgrown wealth of religious bodies, the Erastianizing and secularizing influences consequent on the great western schism, the intoxication connected with the revival of pagan learning, &c., &c., causes none of which had anything in common with the rule of faith. Tenthly, No Reformer was able to indicate when the (supposed) false rule (that of authority) had risen up. When the four first general councils passed their decrees, *anathematizing the doctrines they deemed false*, and excommunicating all who maintained them, private judgment was as clearly repudiated as at the council of Trent. Several of the chief Reformers, indeed, till they had committed themselves irrevocably, appealed to a future general council. What authority could its sentence have had, if private judgment was the rule of faith? Eleventhly, If the church had been for centuries an impostor, arrogating to itself powers which blasphemy alone could claim, it must have been as much tempted to sophisticate the Bible as the creed, in which case, (as the Unitarians, and more lately the Neologians of Germany, have perceived,) a very searching species of Biblical criticism must take place before private judgment could find a text on which to exercise itself. Such criticism can, from its very nature, attain but uncertain results, and consequently can afford a basis to nothing more than a *probable* theology. Twelfthly, The institution of a new rule of faith obviously involved the contradictory positions that the Church had become so corrupt, that to reform it schism itself must be boldly incurred, and the fundamental *Law* of belief changed; and yet that it had remained pure enough to train up men

capable of an enterprise such as no one, since the feast of Pentecost, had ever carried out before. Such a paradox could only have been accounted for by the Reformers having possessed a supernatural mission. In this case miracles would have seemed necessary to attest it. On the contrary, however, miracles, which had been ever claimed by the ancient Church, were commonly repudiated by the new bodies, and classed with impostures, lying wonders, &c. Thirteenthly, No Protestant State was disposed to recognize the claims of "private judgment," except so far as it involved a protest against Rome; yet no Protestant theologian could point out how states, disclaiming infallibility, and at variance with each other, could challenge a higher authority, as interpreters of divine revelation, than the vast ecclesiastical organization which for immemorial ages had included, (over and above its divine claims,) the consent of races and nations. Fourteenthly, The principle of private judgment in reality accorded to the individual no more than he possessed before, viz., the use of his own mental powers; while the method by which it instructed him to use them, involved a loss no less vast than that of the aid which the individual was to derive, (on the opposite rule of faith,) from the collective faculties of the baptized race, brought together in the unity of the Church. St. Thomas Aquinas was confessedly a thinker, as well as Luther or Calvin, but the *method* which he pursued gave him as data the conclusions of the whole Christian world up to his time, and imparted to him thus, beside his own mind, another mind as large as that of Christendom. The use of this larger mind no more involved the suppression of the individual mind, than the use of the telescope involves the loss of one's eyesight.

This brings us to a yet more momentous consideration. The belief in this collective mind of Christendom, which supersedes, not indeed individual intellectual exertion, but private judgment, or merely *isolated* exertion, was no theory invented in later times for the guidance of theological enquirers, but was involved in the very *idea* of the Christian Church. If the Church exists at all, it must be filled with all truth, simply because it is the Body of Christ, Who is Truth itself, and because it is the temple of the Spirit of Truth. If it be also a visible and organic body, it must, by its own nature, manifest abroad that truth

of which it is the tabernacle and shrine. This would result from its own essential nature, even though the Church had never been expressly declared to be the "pillar and ground of the truth," and even though to "hear the Church" had never been proclaimed to be a duty. Given the character and origin of the Church, its infallibility is a necessary deduction. We are too much in the habit of looking on the doctrine of infallibility as though it were a late discovery, or supposed discovery; whereas to believe in it was both the instinct and the necessity of the Church ever since the descent of the Spirit, and the cancelling of the curse of Babel. To doubt it would have involved her in the contradictions that assail a man who doubts his own existence. We are also too apt to look on infallibility with reference to its final end, or one of its final ends, instead of to its origin in the essence of the Church, and her substantial union with Him in whom there is "no darkness at all." We consequently forget that the doctrine of infallibility, far from being an exaggerated claim, is but a negative, and therefore a wholly inadequate mode of expressing an attribute essentially positive which must equally have belonged to the Church, whether or not it had the function of constituting the right "rule of faith." Man is invested with certain attributes, in the natural order, which enable him to engage in commerce. The consequence is, that each individual finds himself, and at a comparatively small cost, possessed of the products of the remotest climates. In this lower sense he "inherits the earth," on the two-fold condition of exercising his own faculties with honest industry, and also of remaining obedient to the laws of human society. But whether he rejects or accepts what might thus be his, the advantages offered to him result from certain essential laws of society and energies of human nature, which exist independently of him, and of their own special results, and which are involved in the idea of humanity developed into civilization. An analogous process takes place in the supernatural order. As isolated individuals, or barbarous tribes, are organized into the unity of nations and of civil society; and as from that union each unit becomes an inheritor of what belongs to the whole; so also all nations, nay, humanity itself, as renewed and reintegrated in the mould of the second Adam, have become invested with a finer unity, the result of a nobler

organization, and re-appear in the form of the Church, universal at once, and one. In that archetypal and perfect form of society are found the chief characteristics that belonged to the lower forms of society, but with a proportionate elevation. In the supernatural as in the natural order, combination produces power. The combination of natural energies produces commercial wealth, and that of natural faculties produces *probable* knowledge as the ordinary guide of life. Combination, in the supernatural order of society, which is founded not on creation but on the incarnation, is that which receives the august name of the "communion of saints." From that fountain flow the treasures of celestial riches, (love, prayer, sacraments, &c.,) and for the same reason we gain thence that supernatural knowledge which comes by faith, not sense, and which is our guide in the heavenly life. Through the *communion* of saints, all things belonging to the supernatural order are *in common* among Christians. Their knowledge must therefore, by necessity, be likewise a *common knowledge*, emanating from the Holy Spirit, who is the mind of the Church, and, passing through the Church, of whom He is the living bond, to the individual. The Church is not an aggregate of individuals; nor a mere collective name for that aggregate, but a living body, the Mother of the Redeemed Race. The individual Christian is born of the Church. He is grafted into Christ by being sacramentally grafted into His body in baptism. From that body, which has sacraments because it *is* the great sacrament, (the Sacrament of Emmanuel, "God with us,") he continues to draw his sacramental life; from its circle are radiated the charities which feed his heart with divine affections; its authority represents to him the mediatorial sceptre of Christ, its head, just as mortal parents (in the natural order) are an emblem of God as a father: and, by parity of reasoning, its light is his light; its knowledge has illuminated him from his childhood up, and imparted to him the Christian faith long before he was able to judge or decide for himself. A mirror of divine truth had thus been created in the world; a mirror in which all lesser mirrors had been melted down, that they might put on a nobler form, and in which all individual aberrations had been corrected. A mind had thus been created, such as the mind of unfallen man would have been; a mind world-wide, in

which the prejudices and limitations of individual minds, as modified by race, climate, or local accident, had no place. It was the mind of the second Adam imparted to the race not only redeemed *by* Him, but restored, remoulded, and reconstituted *in* Him. Such a mind was capable of receiving in its fulness and purity the Christian revelation ; therefore, the Gospel and the Church of Christ were sown by the same hand and at the same time, and grew up inseparably. A body in which the Holy Spirit dwelt personally, was capable of understanding those scriptures inspired by the Holy Spirit, and also of preserving those sacred recollections which the Holy Spirit was sent to call to its mind. Therefore, when the Spirit was given the Church arose in its strength ; and in the might of the same Spirit the Church has ever since combated the world, the flesh, and the devil, competent equally to impart spiritual graces, and to sever between light and darkness by the definition of disputed truth. Now, of this vast and profound doctrine, the importance of which rendered it necessary to include the *mystery* of one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church among the mysteries confessed in the creed, a particular inference relative to "private judgment" was obviously but the smallest part. "Private judgment" was indeed practically superseded by a public or common judgment, more sacred and more certain in proportion as "the truth as it is in Jesus," excels the truth as determined by the caprice of individuals, and individuals who bear contradictory testimony respecting it. Private judgment was also of course negatived wherever it was in opposition to the witness of that body which, from the beginning, had "spoken with authority, not as the scribes," and had ratified its confessions by the words "it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and unto us." But it is equally true that the opposite principle, that of authority, did not exist simply or chiefly as a rule of faith, or for any controversial end. It could not possibly have been eliminated from the mighty dogma of which it was but a part, or rather a resultant. To establish "private judgment" as the rule of faith, must necessarily be to abolish the very *idea* of the Church as a divine mystery, and living power, the organ of Christianity. Conversely, to restore the *idea* of the Church, however faintly that *idea* has looked forth at first from ritual or ordinance, has ever eventually produced more or

less a distrust in, or a contempt for, the high-sounding but barren fallacy of "private judgment." Considering, then, that this new rule of faith could not displace the old one without destroying also a vast deal more besides, nay, uprooting a whole system of doctrines hitherto believed in by nearly all Christendom, and attested by countless passages of Scripture, it must surely have seemed to us a duty, had we lived at the time of the revolt, to have tested pretty severely the fundamental norma on which it rested.

"Tempus non occurrit Ecclesiae." As God can never change, so neither can His truth, or His covenanted mode of revealing it to us. Consequently, what would have been our duty three centuries ago is equally our duty now; and whatever would, three centuries ago, have been our certainty or our uncertainty concerning divine things, until that duty had been faithfully performed, the same must be our certainty or our uncertainty now. That the worldly or the proud should not be disturbed by such uncertainty, is in nowise surprising; but few things attest more a delusion deep-rooted and pervading, than the circumstance that even the devout and the sincere are so often lulled in a fatal security concerning the very foundations of their faith. Enviroined and imprisoned by a false tradition, and blinded by cherished associations, multitudes, the cardinal principle of whose religion is enquiry, are contented practically to follow the authority of some sect which denounces authority, and to make no real enquiry as to that principle, (the rule of faith,) on which, notwithstanding, by their own admission, the whole of our knowledge respecting the *will and ways of God, as revealed in Christ*, must depend. Accustomed to the absence of certainty, they do not feel its loss. Neither the differences between them and their Protestant friends, nor the secession of some of the most learned among their number, nor their own changes of opinion from day to day, awaken them to the fact that they have never honestly thought out the question of the rule of faith. Like her of old "whom the everlasting thunder lulls to sleep," they repose in a charmed rest; and the syren that subdues them is no spirit of harmony, but the storm of "public opinion," or the crash of systems crumbling ever back into chaos. They admit a purgatory or condemn prayers for the dead; assert the apostolic succession, or repudiate the priesthood; insist on the

real presence, or deny baptismal regeneration, avowedly on the ground of special texts, frequently obscure or few: yet they never stay to determine in *what relation* the whole text of Holy Scripture stands to the Christian revelation, and the individual mind to the text of Scripture. Too often they play with the subject; or they are afraid of encountering it; deceived, no doubt, in part, by the circumstance that many precious portions of Catholic teaching, their possession of which they erroneously attribute to private judgment, have descended to them by oral tradition—portions for their use of which they are accountable as for that of their other talents.

If a Protestant of a philosophic mind were once to place himself outside his inherited system, and divest himself of prepossessions, what would be his mode of conducting religious enquiry? First, as a traveller begins with his map, he would *map out the subject of enquiry*, not taking now this road, and now that, as caprice or accident determined; but clearly ascertaining by what mode of access a subject otherwise beyond man could be approached. If he found that avenue to truth to be the "rule of faith," he would close his ears to all whispers calculated to check his progress up the heavenly mountain—all whispers about matters irrelevant, such as the corruptions of individual popes, or beyond his present powers of rightly estimating, such as indulgences. If he did not make the rule of faith the sum total of his enquiry, he would at least make it the initiatory and principal part. To that question he would address himself as he would to any new method proposed to him for the prosecution of scientific, historic, or moral enquiry. He would begin by ascertaining how far the proposed method corresponded with the subject-matter of enquiry. If the method was inductive, he would enquire whether the subject-matter admitted of experiment; if it consisted in introspection or analysis, of "what is deepest within us," he would enquire whether the subject-matter belonged to the region of intuitions, or included facts. Above all, he would endeavour to ascertain how far the proposed method was consistent with itself. If it involved self-contradictions he would be sure it could not be sound.

Confining our attention for the present to the last of these considerations, let us enquire how far the Protestant

rule of faith is consistent with itself, and with the object which it proposes to itself.

For the investigation of this subject, the following tests would seem to be just and appropriate. The failure of that rule when tried by but one of them, would hardly be compatible with soundness in the rule.

1. If the rule of faith be the Bible only, as interpreted by the individual, then this rule must itself be clearly authenticated from Holy Scripture.

2. Protestant theology must itself be practically based on the observance of its own rule, not on the violation of it.

3. The rule must have been acted on in those primitive times when, as Protestantism affirms, Christianity was purest.

4. We must know from Scripture, not from Church authority, what books constitute the canon of inspired Scripture.

5. We must possess, independently of Church authority, a guarantee for the substantial authenticity of the original manuscripts, and a safe mode of ascertaining the true text.

6. The substantial fidelity of our translations must be also guaranteed to us with certainty, yet independently of Church authority.

7. Our rule must provide a means of interpreting Scripture truly.

8. It must enable us to reach the larger and deeper meaning of Holy Scripture, as well as the narrower and more superficial.

9. The rule must itself be a distinct and unequivocal one.

10. It must be one consistent with the propagation as well as the maintenance of Christianity.

11. It must secure us from the admixture of grave error with truth; and thus impart the faith in its purity as well as in its fulness.

12. It must guard us from all fatal errors in ritual as well as in doctrine.

13. Our rule of faith must consist with faith itself, and with the development of those virtues which have their root in faith; with a real belief in a supernatural world, in the objectivity of revelation, and in the hallowing influence of divine knowledge.

Let us now examine these tests in detail.

First, If the rule of faith be the Bible only, as interpreted by the individual, then this rule itself must be clearly authenticated from the Bible. The utter failure of all attempts to find there any such rule is admitted by the more learned and reflecting Protestants, those, namely, who belong to the High-Church school. They have, indeed, their own special difficulties to contend with. First, they have to decide whether they will denounce and reject all Protestant communities, except the Protestant Episcopalian, or whether they will recognize them as brethren; secondly, they have to show how private judgment ceases to be private judgment, because it includes the Fathers as well as the Holy Scriptures as the subject-matter for investigation. However such questions may be answered, the Tractarian arguments against the rule under examination are as stringent as those of the Church. Almost all the texts so confidently relied on by the great mass of Protestants, are as they have often shown, either absolutely irrelevant, or imply a doctrine the opposite of that in defence of which they are pleaded. Invoked to utter malediction against the hosts of Israel, they cannot choose but bless. Thus we are presented with a catalogue of texts extolling the majesty of the Word of God; but on examination, it turns out that most of those texts do not refer to the written Word at all, but to the "Word of Faith which *we preach*," that is to the gospel message as preached first by the Apostles, and ever since by the Apostolic church...for "how shall they teach unless they be sent?" Another class of texts turns out, on investigation, to refer neither to the written Word, nor to the Word preached, but to the Eternal Word...who said to His Apostles, "He that heareth you heareth me." From the Old Testament, likewise, texts are quoted, exalting the "Law of God," as a subject for constant meditation, just as if that expression were equivalent to the Hebrew canon, or to the letter of the Pentateuch. On more careful inquiry, however, the illusion vanishes. The children of Israel were indeed commanded to bear in everlasting remembrance the great things which God had done for them; but that memorial was, as regards the many, transmitted orally, the parents recounting them to their children, not by the diffusion of written books. The people were expressly commanded to seek wisdom at the lips of the priests. Quite true it is that the most sacred canons of

the Divine Law were to be kept "as frontlets between the eyes," and that to cherish them too closely was impossible. But all this is not to the question. No means whatsoever were ordained to make the Hebrews adopt the Protestant rule of faith. Such a course was rendered impossible by the circumstance that printing was unknown in those days; nor does it appear that MS. copies of the Pentateuch were ever multiplied with a zeal approaching to that with which the Holy Scriptures were diffused during the middle ages. On the other hand, a distinct mode was instituted for the determination of hard questions. If any man transgressed, by committing sin, disobeying the covenant, or lapsing into idolatrous worship, he was, after a due trial, to be stoned by the people; but in cases of difficulty a tribunal was expressly appointed, such as private judgment would hardly have sanctioned. "If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversy within thy gates: then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall choose; and thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days and inquire; and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment. * * * And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die; and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel."—Deut. xvii. 8—12.

With the priesthood was placed the rule of faith and the authority of judgment. Thus Moses, when blessing the tribes, says of Levi, "And of Levi he said, let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy Holy One, whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah; who said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children: for they have observed thy word, and kept thy covenant. They shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy Law."—Deut. xxxii. 8—10. To the priesthood, accordingly, Moses committed the Law. It was the book of the synagogue, just as the Bible is the book of the Church. No provision, however, was made to circulate it for the purpose of private interpretation. A very different principle

was adopted, much more like what prevails in the Church, though incomparably less expansive. "And Moses wrote this Law and delivered it to the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel: and Moses commanded them saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose, *thou shalt read* this law before all Israel *in their hearing.*" This was the priesthood of whom so many centuries after our Lord said, "They sit in Moses' seat, therefore all they command do; but do not according to their works, for they say and do not." Even their corruption of morals could not affect their authority. Prophets were sent to the chosen people; but with the true there rose false prophets, and to meet that case a special provision was made. "If thou shalt say in thy heart, 'How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken?' when a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him."—Deut. xviii. 21, 22. Whether the promises of the early Reformers have met a fulfilment in such an increased solidity of Christian faith, propagation of the Gospel, overthrow of traditional authorities, and reverence for the Holy Scriptures, as was expected by those who, three centuries ago, proclaimed deliverance to a world in bondage, need not now be discussed. Thus much at least is plain, that though a prophet might be divinely commissioned to reprove priest or king, no claim to prophetic authority, least of all a claim unattested by miracles, could supersede either the priesthood which Moses had instituted, or the Law which he had committed to their charge.

Had the Pentateuch been circulated with any amount of zeal among the Jews, the rule of faith would have remained unchanged. A single consideration will illustrate this matter. Though the whole Law was contained in the books of Moses, yet to those five books others were successively added, till the canon of the Old Testament, as at present it exists, was the result. In those later portions a very great advance, both in depth and elevation of doctrine, is noticeable, such as might have been expected

as the dispensation of the law approached to that dispensation of grace destined to supersede it. An Anglican writer speaks thus on the subject:—“In the actual books of the Law the doctrine of a future state can scarcely be said to be laid down at all; and in any case it was afterwards brought forward a good deal more prominent by the prophets. Let it be remembered that the existence of angels, and of a Trinity in the Godhead, grew up from the same sources into belief among the Jews; that the doctrine of repentance, and of the just living by faith, was gradually unfolded; and that the prophecies respecting the Messiah assumed a distinctness and precision in them unknown to the Pentateuch.” A corresponding change took place, as the same writer remarks, in the Jewish Ritual. “Old rites were enlarged upon, and new rites introduced. The Law had prescribed nothing for the admission of women and proselytes into the assembly; baptism sooner or later formed the appointed rite; innovations were made in the manner of killing and eating the Passover; in the dress and posture, and in the concomitants of the repast: and these would seem to have been the natural result of dwelling in a land of corn and wine, and regarding it as an abiding inheritance. Tents were discarded for the same reason in the feast of Tabernacles; the drawing of water was appended. New rules were laid down for the observance of the Sabbath; the feasts of Purim and of the Dedication were of modern date. Were our accounts of Jewish mediævalism more copious, we might be able to pursue the details more contemporaneously.” After alluding to the additions made to the divine worship of the Jews by David and Solomon, he proceeds to speak of the writings of judges and prophets, which in time became part of the canon. “Now by what authority were those subsequent writings put so nearly on a level with the books of Moses, but by those who *sat in his seat*, as our Lord says, namely, by the authorities of the synagogue.”* Now the writings thus introduced were either authentic or not authentic:—without the previous determination of this question, private judgment could not even have discovered the subject-matter on which to exercise itself. Yet such a determination was obviously beyond the power of individual criticism. The

* “The Counter Theory.”—J. H. Parker, 1853.

prophets who had flattered the prejudices of the age in which they lived were eventually rejected. The prophets whose writings were ultimately recognized as inspired, were often those who had suffered death because they reproved the passions of kings, or the madness of the people. Error on such subjects was fatal. The sect of the Sadducees, who rose up at a later date, and rejected the authority of the later part of the canon, as the Protestants have rejected the authority of the Deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament, were obliged to abridge their faith in proportion, and discarded the belief in angels, spirits, the resurrection, &c., just as Protestants have discarded prayers for the dead, purgatory, and the invocation of saints. Doubtless they held the authority of the synagogue in as little respect as Protestants hold that of the Holy See. As a necessary consequence three results followed:—their sacred canon became a reduced and imperfect one; their creed shrunk with it; and the faith with which they received that creed wore thinner and thinner, till it had given way to scepticism. So far, then, from the children of Israel having been commanded to make “private judgment” their rule of faith, on the ground that the “whole congregation was holy,” a rule precisely the opposite was given to them contemporaneously with the very earliest portion of their sacred Scriptures; their canon of Scripture itself was one which admitted of perpetual additions, respecting which private judgment no more possessed a faculty of discrimination than each individual possessed the Urim and Thummim, the power of sacrificing, or the function of deciding on leprosy; and the providential circumstances under which their lot was cast, did not render possible to them an access to their sacred writings comparable to that which Catholics enjoy. The very slightest exercise of attention and candour will suffice to show that this statement is perfectly consistent with any number of texts celebrating the holiness of God’s commandments, and the blessedness of those whose delight is in meditating His word, and whose feet are guided by His law into the paths of peace. Such expressions are to be found perpetually in Catholic writers also. They mean that the Gospel is our light, and also that the written Gospels are among our chief means of edification, especially when studied in the spirit of those monastic communities who read it daily on their knees,

bending over it, not as over a scroll to be criticised, but as over a sacred and unfathomable well, in which humility may ever behold a divine reflection, and from which devotion may ever derive fresh health and nourishment. The real question at issue is not the dignity of the Bible, which the Protestant rule affects to exalt, but which it practically disparages, just as we should inferentially deny the depth of a river if we asserted that it was possible for a child to wade across it. The real question is not its sacredness, which surely cannot be denied by that church which has ever retained the whole canon, and asserted its plenary inspiration; but is one respecting its special office in the church. What God has given for one purpose cannot be made by the will of man to discharge a different one. If it be abused, the right use of it will be missed, and the blessing forfeited. The point in question is, what are the conditions which God has appointed for its profitable use? The Church replies to this question by referring to a large class of texts, distinctly asserting that as a guide has been given to lead her into all truth, so she is the guide appointed to lead her children into a right understanding of the Scriptures. It is plain that the Bible is the Bible only when *rightly understood*; and that if it be understood according to the mind of man, not to the mind of the Spirit, it ceases to be a divine, and becomes a human, book. It is plain not less that that alone can be a sound exposition of Holy Scripture which includes at once a clear and honest interpretation of two classes of texts, those relating to the sacredness of the Bible, and those relating to its interpretation. What, then, are we to think of a system which either quietly ignores the latter class, or else explains them only by explaining them away? Is any compensation made for the loss thus sustained by the most emphatic assertion of truths contained in a different class of texts, which the Church has also ever maintained, and concerning which there is no dispute? Such are those which affirm that whatever contradicts Holy Scripture is false, and that the traditions which make it void are the traditions of men; that teachers ignorant of Holy Scripture will teach erroneously; that men who hear the word and keep it are blessed; that those who will not believe it, and its commissioned preachers and expounders, ("Moses and the prophets,") would not believe "though one rose from the

dead." It is hard to understand how sincere thinkers can imagine that such passages bear on the "Rule of Faith" at all. A Protestant, indeed, will often naturally think that a Catholic does not read the Bible frequently enough, since he does not know that it is for edification, not in order to form his creed, (which he has never lost,) that a Catholic reads it; and since he does not know how large a portion of the Breviary, Missal, and most Catholic books of devotion, consists of Holy Scripture so arranged that the mere relative position of passage with passage diffuses over the sacred text a light such as proceeds from the countenance of her alone who ever looks on God. This is, however, a consideration beside the matter, even if it were sound. The reading of Scripture, like the frequentation of sacraments, will vary in the Church according to the devotion of persons and times; but the rule of faith, like the faith itself, must remain always the same.

There are, it is true, a few texts upon which the Protestant rule of Faith finds something like a support. Their real meaning is well brought out in the following passage from a Tract entitled "Protestantism weighed in its own balance, and found wanting."*

"First, he quotes the words of our Lord, (St. John, v. 39,) 'Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me.' But where do these words contain a command from God, bidding all men to read the Bible, and assuring them that the Bible is a sufficient guide into all truth? Our Lord bade the Jews examine the Scriptures of the Old Testament, for that they testify of Him as the promised Messias; and as soon as they had recognized Him as such, they should at once listen to His words, receive His doctrine, and obey His commandments. ** He made the same use of the Scriptures as Catholics do in speaking to Protestants at this day. The Catholic says to Protestants, 'Search the Scriptures,' for these are they which testify of the Church as well as of her head; they expressly command you to 'hear the Church, and declare that she is 'the pillar and ground of the truth.' You ought therefore to listen to her voice, receive her doctrines, and obey her commandments. Our Lord bade the Jews examine the Scriptures for a particular object:—is this the same

* "Clifton Tracts."

thing as commanding Christians to examine the Scriptures for every object? He sent them to the Scriptures as testifying of Him the Teacher, to whom, when recognized, they were to submit. Because the Scriptures testify plainly to the appointed teacher, the Church, does it therefore follow that it sets forth all other truths so clearly, as that you should need no other teacher but it? Nay, does not the very contrary conclusion follow?"

"But, secondly, the Protestant quotes the words of St. Paul to Timothy, (2 Tim. iii. 15-17.) 'From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' Now, of course the only Scriptures that Timothy could have known from a child were the Old Testament. Does the Protestant, then, mean to assert that the mere reading of the Old Testament is sufficient to teach a man all that is necessary for him to know, in order that he may be saved? If so, what need was there of the New Testament? If, on the other hand, he does not consider that the Scriptures here spoken of are sufficient for this purpose, it is impossible that this text should prove that they would be made sufficient by the addition of others, for it says nothing whatever of any addition that was ever to be made to them at all."

"But, thirdly, we are sometimes told that the Bereans were good Protestants, and are even expressly commended as such by one of the writers of the New Testament, because we read of them, in the Acts of the Apostles, (xvii. 11,) that 'they were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so.' Surely, however, no one can pretend to argue from these words that the Bereans made the same use of the Holy Scriptures as Protestants insist upon now-a-days. The very contrary can be clearly shown by an examination of the history. For what was the real state of the case? St. Paul had 'reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus whom he preached to them was Christ.'

(ver. 2.) If then they would listen to the preacher at all, they would do no other than search the Scriptures ; for it was precisely this to which he had directed their attention. * * * ' Many of them believed.' But what did they believe ? Did they really believe only what St. Paul was able to prove to them out of the Old Testament ? for you must remember that this was the only part of the Bible then in existence. * * If so, they could not even believe that Jesus was the Christ, since this could not possibly be proved out of the Old Testament, every word of which had been written long before Jesus was born. * * Even so a Catholic Priest, at the present day, might open and allege the Scriptures of the New Testament in argument with a man who acknowledges their authority, and he might show that our Lord established a society which was to endure throughout all ages, even until the end of time, and that He gave this society power and authority to teach all nations all things whatsoever He had commanded. Then, having alleged thus much out of the Written Word of God, he might still follow the example of St. Paul, and go on to show that ' this Jesus whom he preached was Christ ; ' that the Church which he preached to them was, in very deed, the society to which such high and noble privileges were promised in the Holy Scripture."

And while such strained or exaggerated interpretations were forced upon a few texts which, as we have seen, find a complete explanation in the Catholic system, the numerous texts asserting the authority of the Church were set aside. " All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe whatever I have commanded you ; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) " He that heareth you, heareth Me ; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me." " Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted ; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." ... These are texts which a long series of ages and nations, of Fathers and of Councils, believed to apply not less to the Apostolic Church than to the Apostles, and yet which obviously assert a principle the opposite of private judgment. " If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as an heathen man, and a publican." " That good thing which was committed to thee, keep by

the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us." " And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach them to others also." " If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of Christ." " *We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us: he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.*" " Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle." These are a few among the passages to which the Fathers had constantly appealed against the self-will of heretics in early times, and when innovations were proposed far less important than the inauguration of a new Rule of Faith, or the expurgation of doctrines admitted by all to have been included in the Church's teaching during far the greater part of her existence. How were such passages met? They were either ignored, or taken separately, not in their cumulative force, and then reduced to nothing by the same spare and sceptical system of interpretation by which Unitarians evade the force of the texts relating to the Holy Trinity. Texts, like facts, are called stubborn things; but notwithstanding, they prove ductile in the glowing hands of controversialists emancipated from all traditional interpretations. Yet it seems no great stretch of candour to admit that where two classes of texts exist...as is the case with respect to most of the great Mysteries of the Faith, including, as these do, converse verities which need to be separately enforced...that alone can be the true meaning which will explain both classes.

2ndly. Another test, by which the rule of private judgment may be tried is this. Has Protestantism really acted upon it, or does Protestant theology practically rest on the violation of it? The latter is the truth. The Bible has not been the real arbiter of Protestant theology, urgently as it has been insisted on in defence of favourite positions. It has already been seen how it has disposed of all those texts relating to the Church by which the rule of private judgment is negatived. Yet these texts alone place Protestantism in a dilemma from which there is no extrication. If the Catholic interpretation of them be true, then Protestant theology must be false; if, on the other hand, the larger portion of the Christian world be

deceived with respect to those texts, then the Bible cannot be a plain book which he who runs can read. The circumstance that Catholics find in the Bible a rule of faith negativing that of private judgment, does not prevent them from enjoying all faculties, without exception, which Protestants can boast for the elucidation of Scripture ;—any more than the possession of eye-sight prevents a man from exercising the sense of touch also, and corroborating, by the evidence of a second sense, what that of a former one has already indicated. Equally strong is the conviction of at least five-sixths of the Christian body, (including both the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern communities,) that on many other subjects also Protestantism runs directly counter to the strongest statements of Scripture—a conviction which, if erroneous, confutes the Protestant rule of faith as decidedly as if not erroneous ; since, if vast ecclesiastical bodies, including many of the most learned and holy men who have ever lived, can thus, for long successive centuries, and equally during their union and subsequently to the Western Schism, have mistaken the sense of Holy Scripture, it is almost a contradiction in terms to say that a private individual should be exempt from danger of the like error. If the whole Church of God, in East and West, was allowed to lie for centuries in most grievous errors ;—nay, if the whole world was, for 800 years, and more, drowned in idolatry, of all sins the most hateful in God's eyes,* was it not equally possible that the Reformers might have been allowed to fall into error respecting a particular doctrine, extemporized suddenly, and in the midst of manifold confusions, when morals were confessedly low, tyranny far spread, and rebellion emergent ? Might not the rule of faith have been the erroneous doctrine in question ? and must not the superstructure be as insecure as the foundation ?

To apply this second test a little more in detail. The primary law of social life is that of marriage. The plainest expressions used by our Lord Himself forbid divorce in every case except one, and marriage with a divorced person in all cases. Divorce, notwithstanding, is allowed for the most trivial causes, and without dispensation, or any special ground, in that country which was the cradle

* Homily.

of the Reformation ; and in England divorced persons are married again by Clergymen who contend that the text of Scripture is the sole arbiter of faith and morals ! Polygamy, on the other hand, is not prohibited by the letter of the sacred text. It was forbidden by the Church as inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and injurious to the dignity of that which had been elevated into a sacrament. Yet Protestantism (notwithstanding such exceptions as are to be found in the opinions of Luther, and the conduct of Luther and Cranmer, who indulged their respective sovereigns in polygamy,) absolutely prohibits polygamy. In the latter case it preserves orthodoxy by the violation of its rule of faith ; in the former it discards both.

Again, the primary worship of the Christian Church consists in the offering up of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.* Such was the belief of the first Christians who continued daily in the "breaking of bread." Such was the belief of the early Church, which referred to the Holy Eucharist the celebrated text in Malachi, concerning that pure oblation which was to be offered in all lands, from the rising of the sun to the setting of the same. St. Paul, referring to the Holy Eucharist, says expressly, "We have an altar which they cannot partake of," &c. Our Lord commanded His Apostles, and with them their successors, to offer this sacrifice, saying, "Do this in remembrance of Me," when He Himself was offering it and instituting it. The reality of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, one with that offered in a bloody manner once for all on Calvary, and, in a bloodless manner, offered at all times in heaven, depends, of course on the reality of Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist. That presence is asserted in a multitude of texts. "If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (John vi. 51.) "This is my body,"...words could hardly be plainer. Equally express is St. Paul. "The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" "He that eateth of this bread, and drinketh of this cup unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." "We are all one bread," &c. Surely

* See Archdeacon Wilberforce on the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist."

these texts are at least as explicit as those in favour of infant baptism. Yet it is notorious that the two great mysteries which they assert are denied by the greater part of Protestants in deference to a preconceived notion of spirituality so negative and superficial in character, that if it were true, it would condemn the doctrine of the Incarnation as carnal. On the other hand, Protestants retain other practices with reference to worship for which no clear and stringent New Testament warrant can be found, such as the observance of festivals, congregational worship considered as a necessary and perpetual ordinance, and, above all, the abandonment of the Sabbath, and the celebration in its place of the first day of the week. That the example of the early Christians, in such matters, was intended to constitute a permanent obligation, is a truth that rests not on the text of Scripture, but on the authority of the Church.

Again, the primary law of the Church, as an organic body, is its Unity. It is one because its Head is one, because the Spirit which guides and rules it is one, and because its faith is one. Being a visible body, its Unity must be as visible as its Apostolicity ; and for this a divine provision was made by the supremacy of St. Peter's See. To this supremacy very many texts refer. When Peter was first called his special function was marked by a change in his name analogous to that made in the case of Abraham. "Thou *shalt be* called Cephas." When the time was fulfilled our Lord addressed him again, and said, after Simon had confessed the Messiahship of Christ, "I say unto thee that *thou art* Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it ; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." So far from the privilege of Peter being identical with that of the other Apostles, because in some instances the Apostolic College, in union with him, possessed the functions which to him only were committed singly, the difference between him and the rest is distinctly expressed. Our Lord tells him that Satan had desired to have them, (in the plural,) that he might sift them as wheat ; "but I have prayed for *thee*, that thy faith fail not ; and thou, when thou art converted, *strengthen thy brethren.*" Again he is asked three times, "lovest thou me *more than these?*" before to him is committed the rule of the whole flock,

"feed my sheep, feed my lambs ;" a distinction being here as plainly marked between him and the other Apostles, with reference to his love, as in the previous charge with reference to his faith.* Entering on his sacred charge, Peter opens the commission of the Gospel to the Jews. When the Gentiles are to be admitted he is the Apostle to receive them also. Peter takes measures for filling up the Apostolic College, by asserting the necessity of choosing an Apostle in the place of Judas. Peter works the first miracle. Peter capitally condemns Ananias and Sapphira. In the first council, after no small dissension and disputation, Peter speaks, and judgment is given accordingly. Throughout the New Testament, wherever a list of the Apostles is given, the name of Peter stands at the head of the list. How is it that these texts, with most Protestants, mean nothing? Of course they do not amount to scientific demonstration, which has no place in religion; but to any one not prepossessed by a special tradition, are they not far more striking, when taken cumulatively, than the texts adduced to prove either that Episcopacy, or the institute of Presbyters, is of perpetual obligation in the Church?

It would be endless to point out all texts which, though at least in the judgment of the most eminent Fathers, before the division of East and West, and of the enormous majority of Christians at the present day, they are plain enough, have, notwithstanding, been set aside by "Bible Christians." Christ has instituted a sacrament for the remission of sins, viz., Baptism; yet Anabaptists, Quakers, and others, reduce to nothing the meaning of the texts which relate to it:—and in the "united Church of England and Ireland," the question of Baptismal Regeneration is an open one. Christ has instituted a sacramental means for forgiving sins after baptism, viz., Absolution. Accordingly He says to the Apostles, and in them to their successors, "whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted." St. James says, "confess your sins one to another;" and we know that the early Christians did confess, first publicly, and then privately, and were absolved. Yet the greater number of Protestants evade the force of these texts by a mode of interpretation as lax

* In neither of these passages is the full force of the original clearly expressed by the translation of the Established Church.

as that which explains away the meaning of the words, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." What then is to be done for those in whom either original sin, or sin after baptism, continues unforgiven?

Again, what can possibly replace the sacrament of Confirmation if thereby the Holy Ghost is indeed conveyed? We read in the Acts, (viii. 5, 17,) that the Apostles, Peter and John, were sent down to Samaria to confirm converts whom Philip, the Deacon, had baptized, but whom he was not qualified to confirm. "They laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Yet most of the Protestant bodies reject confirmation. How do they know that congregational worship was intended to be a perpetual ordinance, and that confirmation not so intended? Is not the "laying on of hands" distinctly included by St. Paul among the "principles of the doctrine of Christ," together with "the doctrine of baptism, of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment?" (Heb. vi. 2.)

Again, as to Holy Orders, we read that the Holy Ghost said, "separate me Barnabas and Paul for the work whereunto I have called them; and when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed." Afterwards Barnabas and Paul "ordained Elders in every Church." We are told of those who are "appointed by the Holy Ghost as overseers, to feed the flock of God;" and St. Paul, writing to Timothy, says, "I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gifts of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." Yet multitudes of Protestant sects see no more in these texts than in those that refer to the visibility of the Church, and the unity of the faith, and of the fold. Accordingly they reject ordination. Is it a slight error, and a matter not "fundamental," to reject ordinances that convey the Holy Ghost? If not, then the rule of private judgment must lead men into fatal error. The united Church of England and Ireland retains ordination and confirmation, but rejects the sacrament of Extreme Unction. St. James says, "Is any man sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." The Established Church sets this text at nought, and thus deprives the dying

Christian of the last aid, whether spiritual only, or spiritual and temporal both, designed for him by the Divine mercy while still in this world. The whole of the Catholic, and also the Eastern Church, is against her; and she can assign no more conclusive reason for believing the rite in question to have been of temporary institution, than the other Protestants can assign for believing the same with respect to ordination or confirmation. She denounces the sects in question instead of the rule which misleads them, and which, in such cases, could not possibly, however momentous the matter at issue, impart certainty. Can any impartial person assert that these texts are plainer, or more numerous than those which relate to the Primacy of St. Peter?

So, with respect to Purgatory, there are at least half a dozen texts which, in the judgment of St. Augustine, bore in the most important way on that doctrine, and searchingly set forth the awfulness even of forgiven sin. Protestant theology passes them by, deriving from them no light, and imparting to them no explanation. On the subject of fasting there are crowds of texts which, to most Protestants, mean nothing. Such are the texts that relate to mortification, celibacy, the intercession of saints, the reverence paid to angels, and their care of us, the reward and merit which God is pleased to attach to good works, thereby "crowning in us His own gifts," the evangelical counsels, and the hidden life, the difference between venial and deadly sin, the duty of obedience spiritual and civil, the personality of the devil, evil spirits, sorcery, vows, miracles, and relics, the exclusiveness of the gospel-scheme, the fatal character of heresy and schism, excommunication, certainty of faith as distinguished from opinion, the supernatural character of sanctity, the justice of God, eternal punishment, &c., &c. On all these subjects Scripture is full of texts which Protestantism has long since learned not to observe, or is daily losing sight of. A theology that did justice to them could not escape, in these days, the reproach of being superstitious, fanatical, mystical, dangerous, and cruel.

3rdly. Let us next try the third test. So far from private judgment having been the Christian's guide in primitive times, it did not then please God to afford him any object upon which it could have been exercised. The last

book of the Bible was not written till the end of the first century. The canon of Scripture was not determined, and the authentic books discriminated from the spurious, till after a second century had passed away. It was therefore impossible that the Bible, as interpreted by the individual's private judgment, should, in those early times, have been the rule of faith. To suppose that the early Christians were what is now called "Bible Christians," is as preposterous as to assert that the Greeks and Romans used artillery in their warfare. The guide of the primitive Christian was the Church, which obeyed the apostolic injunction to Timothy, and kept safe the deposit of faith. Particular Epistles, and whatever other portions of Holy Scripture existed in particular Churches, were frequently read aloud and expounded in them. It is thus that the modern Catholic also is taught, except that the Breviary, Missal, and other books of devotion, contain a far larger portion of Scripture than was accessible to the early Christian.

After the disputes concerning the doubtful books had been settled, and the canon determined, it was as impossible as before to act on the Protestant rule of faith. God's providence had not yet given to man the art of printing; and there are more bibles in one Catholic city at the present day, than existed in a large province of the old Roman empire. So it continued till the art of printing was discovered. It was thus in the time of the martyrs. It was thus in the time when the great general councils were defining the Christian faith. It was thus when the nations of Europe were successively evangelized. It was thus, not by man's neglect, but by the dispensation of God. Holy Scripture, far from being neglected, was faithfully preserved, assiduously copied, employed for the purposes of instruction, profoundly studied, meditated, commented on by the most learned fathers and schoolmen. Yet, in these heroic ages of faith and love, no one dreamed of the Protestant use of the Bible.

The Greek schism never admitted the rule of private judgment. It was proclaimed at the revolt, called a reformation. Under the pretence of exalting the Bible, the judgment of the individual was exalted as the interpreter of the Bible. Two principles which have nothing in common were thus connected by a verbal equivocation. But even then it was impossible to carry out a maxim which

nature as well as providence disowns. It was necessary for every man to have a faith; while not one in a thousand was capable of forming even an opinion for himself. A few men, accordingly, wrote commentaries on Holy Scripture, and drew up so-called confessions of faith; and the many became vehement in defence of the traditions thus originated. Universal education is obviously among the pre-requisites for private judgment really becoming the rule in any religious community which takes the text of Scripture for its guide. It is not till within the last century that any serious thought has been bestowed on the education of the masses; and even yet but little progress has been made in the enterprize. Should it ever be accomplished, the Protestant problem will remain as far as ever from solution. The young (the larger portion of the human race) will present an obstacle as insurmountable as the poor do now. They are not only Christians, but ordinarily the best Christians. They must accordingly possess the Christian faith; but for them to extract it from Holy Scripture by their private judgment, is plainly impossible.

IV. If the Protestant rule of faith be true, we must know, on Scriptural evidence, what is the true canon of Scripture. This is a difficulty which few Protestants can bring themselves to meet fairly, or even to look full in the face. Mr. Goode devotes a long chapter to the subject (the sixth), without ever touching the real ground of dispute. Those who say that the Bible, interpreted by the individual mind, aided by the Holy Spirit, is the sole source of our religious knowledge, mean the pure Bible, not a spurious one. If the authorized edition of it contained but a single chapter interpolated by human fraud or error, the whole of our faith might be sophisticated:—how much more then, if it contained whole books not of divine origin! Again, the Bible to which the Protestant refers, is the whole Bible, not a part of it. Had the Epistle to the Galatians alone been lost, we might have heard but little comparatively of the Lutheran theory of justification. Now St. Paul makes mention of an epistle of his to the Laodiceans, which no longer exists. (Colossians iv. 16.) How can the Protestant determine what doctrine may not have been contained in that epistle? How can he be sure that many other epistles may not be lost also? Had the last chapter of the last book of the New Testament been lost, Protes-

tants would have missed the most specious of the texts which they allege against the veneration of the saints. The articles of the Established Church say, that "in the name of the Holy Scriptures we do understand the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." Such a test would be fatal to the Protestant Bible, since it is notorious that, not individuals merely, but large bodies, disputed the canonicity, not of chapters only, but of whole books contained in it, namely, the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of St. John, the Epistles of St. James and of St. Jude, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. The last chapter of the Gospel of St. Mark, the history of the bloody sweat, and the consoling angel in the Gospel of St. Luke, have been also subjects of doubt. On what ground, then, were these books included in the Protestant canon? On the traditional authority of the Church?—a sound rule, doubtless, but not a Protestant one.

Again, before the canon was finally determined, several books, not now included in it, were by many in the Church received as inspired. If they really were inspired, it is obvious that neither the Catholic nor the Protestant canon is the Bible, but only a part of it. How does the Protestant know that they were not inspired? Holy Scripture gives him no information on this matter; philosophy is not the guide he goes by; and miraculous or angelical guidance he has none. He practically accepts as conclusive the authority of the Church, which decided on rejecting the books in question. It is in vain to say that he is determined by historic research and literary criticism. If this be all he has to guide him, he is confessedly in the very region of doubt: and a probable opinion is the utmost which he would be likely to reach. Now if we have but opinion as to the canon of Scripture, it is plain that we have but opinion as to a theology built exclusively on Scripture. Such a statement would, therefore, undermine the very foundation of faith.

That the researches of mere individuals who believe that they have the Spirit, afford no sure guidance in this matter, is proved by the contradictory judgments of Protestants. Thus, the Established Church of England, ever since the reign of Queen Elizabeth, has rejected the Deutero-canonical books; yet the Homilies, as set forth in that of

Edward VI., quote them as Holy Scripture, and ascribe them to the Holy Ghost. Luther at one time rejected the Epistle of St. James, and other parts of the New Testament:—the Calvinists, that of St. Jude, and the Apocalypse. These are matters on which, not only error, but uncertainty deprives Protestantism of its very foundations. If the Reformers had no sure guidance on such essential points, what commission could they have had to revolutionize theology?

The question of the Deutero-canonical books was investigated with the utmost care at the Council of Trent. Both early and late councils were referred to in favour of the existing Catholic Canon, together with the writings of Sts. Cyprian, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Basil, and other Fathers. The Protestants had claimed certain of the Fathers as on their side. The Catholics answered, that when they wrote, the matter had not been fully investigated or decided on by the Church. The Protestants had asserted that the books in question had formed no part of the Hebrew Canon. The Catholics maintained that they had been received with the utmost reverence by the Hellenistic Jews, and that the earliest Christian writers and martyrs, as Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, and Irenæus, refer to them in the same manner as to other parts of Scripture. They quoted St. Augustine: “We must not omit those books which we know to have been written before the coming of Christ, and which are received by the Church of the Saviour Himself, although they be not received by the Jews.” Now, assuredly the Church, notwithstanding her conviction of her own infallibility, used all those human means for arriving at the truth which God accords to us as a secondary instrumentality. Neither did she stand alone in her judgment. The East has confirmed the decision of the West; and in 1672 a Greek synod, held at Jerusalem under the Patriarch Dosithenus, acknowledged as canonical the same books to which the Council of Trent had already attached that character. How, then, is it possible for the Protestant to feel certain that the Church is wrong, and that the truth is to be found among those only who could neither agree with the Catholics, with the Greeks, with each other, or consistently with themselves?

On this subject Protestants have in truth no certainty except that which results from self-will. Out of many circumstances which attest this statement, it will be suffi-

cient here to refer to but a few. How does it happen, then, that this important question being plainly one of learned and critical investigation, the Protestant who has never examined into the subject, enjoys an imaginary confidence with reference to it, at least equal to that of the more learned Protestant? Does he go by authority? But authority is the very principle he repudiates. The great preponderance of existing ecclesiastical authority, moreover, is notoriously against him. Historic criticism is a region which he acknowledges that he has never entered, and into which he is not qualified to enter. Yet, his position requires that he should be *certain*; and, accordingly, certain he is. What is the value of his certainty on other matters, may be inferred from his certainty on this. It is an illusion, consecrated by casual associations. He will say, perhaps, that he does not *feel* the inspiration of what he calls the Apocrypha, as he does that of Isaiah and the Psalms. But such a test would disparage many other books of the Old Testament as well as the Deutero-canonical, and would involve us rapidly in that German Neology which has dealt as roughly with the Bible as with the Church. Once more:—how can the Protestant be *certain* that the doctrines to which he objects, as insufficiently supported by Scripture, are not confirmed by the lost books referred to in the Old Testament?

V. On the Protestant rule of faith we ought to find in Holy Scripture a guarantee likewise for the authority of the text. Our existing versions are founded on a comparison of conflicting manuscripts, which do not claim to be original. Of these, some have been rejected and some accepted; but, unless assured by an infallible authority, that in this process we have fallen into no error *affecting faith*, it seems hard to know how we can arrive with certainty at any such conclusion. This question is one of the most immediate importance. The Unitarians justify their heresy on the ground that several of the most important texts appealed to by Trinitarians are spurious. They urge, that they are as competent judges on this matter as the Trinitarian Protestants; since they, too, accept the Protestant rule of faith, and solicit the Divine aid in investigating the Bible. The more orthodox Protestants assert that they have sophisticated the Bible in order to countenance their own pre-conceptions. Now, a Catholic might

well bring such a charge against Protestants, saying that they had rejected the Deutero-canonical books, in order to get rid of such texts as that which affirms that it is "a good and wholesome thought to pray for the dead." But in the mouth of a Protestant the statement is utterly unmeaning. If the Bible be our sole rule of faith, our primary care must be to make that rule a sound one, by weeding from the Bible all corruptions or additions. If, either through error or through fraud, the Church of the middle ages was capable of appending whole books to the canon, though not inspired, much more must it have been capable of introducing spurious texts into it. No one, whether Catholic or Protestant, affirms that the text of Holy Scripture is perfect. Biblical criticism, on the principles of the "Bible Protestant," must be the highest, if not the only, important part of theology; and to reject certain results of biblical criticism without learned investigation, because they contradict our theological opinions, is, to act, not on the Protestant rule of faith, but in direct opposition to it. The orthodox Protestant is right in his conclusions, when dealing with Unitarians, but only by a happy inconsistency, and because he has inherited from the Catholic Church at once the doctrine of the Trinity, the authentic text on that doctrine, and the Catholic interpretation of that text. On the long run, however, principles carry men along with them whether willingly or not; and, accordingly, Unitarianism is the gulf to which Protestantism ever tends when its ardour has died out, and its scepticism only remains.

VI. Again, the Protestant Rule of Faith would require a scriptural guarantee, ensuring fidelity in the translations of the Bible. How is it possible for a Protestant to feel assured, on scriptural grounds, that he has not been misinformed as to the meaning of some passages respecting which scholars are at variance? He cannot entertain a confidence based on a general reliance on the goodness of God; for the very question at issue is whether the rashness of man has not discarded the provisions made by the Divine Goodness to preserve us from important error. Least of all can he assert the infallibility of his own individual teachers, or of such criticism as he has himself adopted at their suggestion. How can he know whether a particular Greek expression is rightly translated "repent" or "do

penance?" And yet, if the latter should be the correct rendering, he has been living all his life in as overt disobedience to the Divine commands, as if he had never partaken of the Lord's Supper, or frequented congregational worship. How many among the unlearned are qualified to determine whether the command of St. Paul be to observe the "ordinances" taught by him, or the "traditions" in the Catholic sense of the term? How many have ever enquired whether another text ought to be rendered, "search the Scriptures," or "ye search the Scriptures?" How many have the means of determining whether the text which affirms that no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation means that each passage is to be interpreted by the Church, not by the private individual, or simply that it is to be compared with other passages?

VII. Above all, we should require a Scriptural guarantee that those who use the Protestant rule of faith will be rightly guided by it in their interpretation of Scripture. It is a poor sophism to point to those texts which affirm that all Scripture was given for man's instruction. All this is insisted on equally by the Catholic Church; but the question at issue is, by what key (the Protestant or Catholic method of interpretation,) the casket is to be unlocked. It is vain to say that though the mind of man is naturally weak and blind, it is yet enlightened by the Holy Spirit; for all this likewise is but a fragment of admitted Catholic doctrine. The point at issue is, whether the Holy Ghost, "who spoke by the prophets," and through whom alone they are intelligible, be given to the Church, and to the individual in union with and subordination to the Church;—or be given to individuals separately, and irrespectively of their union with the Visible Body of Christ. According to Catholic teaching the Holy Spirit is the mind of the Church; and though individuals can neither think one good thought, nor do one good action except through His aid, they cannot possess that aid except by union with Christ their Head, from Whom and from the Father, the Holy Spirit ever proceeds; nor can they maintain union with their Head, except through union with His mystical Body. Whatever be the covenant which God has made with man, it is according to that covenant, and on no other terms, that man can enjoy the Divine gifts.

No one in secular matters, would be allowed to manage his own affairs who was incapable of distinguishing between the value of a gift, and the right means of using that gift ; no one would be thought an honest man who perceived the distinction, and yet refused to acknowledge or attend to it. If it has pleased God to give us the Church as well as the Bible, and if we yet look for guidance to the latter only, we are in the position of one who should reject the New Testament, on the ground that St. Paul had assured Timothy that the Scriptures of the Old Testament, in which only he had been instructed from his youth, were sufficient to make him wise unto salvation. If the Church's teaching constitute even a part of the system God has instituted for our instruction, to discard her authority, on the ground that the Bible is sufficient by itself, must be as fatal an act of will-worship, as though we were to discard the Epistles, on the ground that all necessary lights may be found in the Gospels.

No one can be united to truth in its more spiritual forms, who despises it in the humbler form of Fact. Experience has in this matter tested the Protestant rule of faith. Protestantism is not the name of a religion, but of a thousand religions, and a single protest. From the earliest times it divided into innumerable sects, which appealed generally to the same rule of faith. A rule of faith which, in place of telling faith what it is to believe, sanctions equally the most opposite forms of belief, and thereby renders the exercise of faith impossible, is as clearly a failure as a key that will not open a lock, or a knife that will not cut. A rule that bends in the hand of him who uses it is no rule.

The allegation that the Protestant rule of faith only fails from lack of devotion in those that use it, is contradictory to fact. The Puritans and Anabaptists were at least as fervent in prayer as Protestants of a staider character, and beyond most others insisted on the doctrine of grace. Luther, who asserted the Real Presence, in a form of his own devising, and Zuinglius, who denied it in all forms alike, are both held by their followers to have been "men of prayer."* Who will take on him to

* The fact that men who have recourse to God in prayer, arrive at opposite conclusions, in no way contradicts the promise of Christ, that if we ask we shall receive. (Matt. vii. 7. comp. Jas. i. 5.) 1st. Because prayer has its conditions, *e. g.* humility, obedience,

say that the late Dr. Channing, though a Unitarian, did not seek divine aid in the exercise of his private judgment, as well as Dr. Chalmers, and Dr. Chalmers as well as Dr. Pusey, though the latter thinks the Apostolical Succession one of the notes of Christ's Church, and the former was no believer in the "Sacramental system?" Do not the Quakers believe in the teaching of the Spirit? and have they not the Bible also? Yet they believe that it is the Living, or Inward Word, not the Written Word, that is to guide us. A Protestant may say of his brother that he differs from him because he has not the Spirit, and is not a child of God; but he cannot prevent a rejoinder being made in the same words, and with precisely the same show of reason. Neither can he deny that his opponent shews all the same outward signs of grace which he shows himself. If, then, these signs are illusory in the one case, so may they be in the other; and if in his neighbour's instance a strong internal persuasion be also but an illusion, so may it be one in his own. It is worth observing here that a violation of charity is forced upon the Protestant by his rule of faith, to which a Catholic is never tempted. A Catholic is never either called upon or permitted to judge an individual; because, though he knows that heresy is incompatible with salvation, he cannot tell whether any particular person be a heretic, or be excused by an "invincible ignorance" of the truth,—that is, by an ignorance the result of circumstance, and not proceeding from the will. The Protestant, on the other hand is obliged, either to give up the sufficiency of his rule of faith, or to account for its failure by the supposition that none of those whose belief differs from his own on fundamental points, can have those dispositions without which no one can see God.

faith, &c. 2nd. Because God has not promised any fresh revelation, and has given a sufficient guide in His Church. Those, therefore, who, like the early Reformers, abandoned the true Church, had no right to look for an answer to prayer, inasmuch as they were living in wilful disobedience. While such heretics as are irresponsible for their error, though if they pray aright, they will undoubtedly receive sufficient guidance from God to save their souls, have no right to expect direct illumination on particular points. The whole line of argument used above is (as is obvious) addressed to Protestants on their own grounds.—"Protestantism weighed in its own Balance."

True charity is exercised towards the individual, [not towards the doctrine. Protestantism is forced to be latitudinarian as to doctrine, up to a certain point, and, beyond that point to be uncharitable to the individual.

Not less vain is the plea that those who use the Protestant rule of faith, sincerely and devoutly, differ among themselves only in matters not fundamental. It is, in the first place, directly opposed to fact, as is proved by the instances to which reference has already been made. To ground a statement that all Protestants are substantially orthodox, on the assertion that Socinians and Quakers are not true Protestants, is a juggle, not an argument. As a matter of fact, moreover, Protestant sects can never agree as to what are, and what are not fundamental doctrines;—nay, even an individual Protestant can hardly ever be prevailed on to state what doctrines he regards as fundamental. If he says they are those included in the Apostles' Creed, or in the Nicene, he cannot show that his own rule of faith, or even that a belief in the inspiration of the New Testament, ranks among them; and on the other hand, he finds that the doctrines of Limbo, and of the Double Procession, of their number. If he says that the fundamental doctrines are those contained in the Bible, he is prevaricating as much as if he boasted that he knew where to find a lost treasure, because he knew it was at the bottom of the sea. The question is not *where* the truth is, but *what* it is. If he says they are those which lie on the surface of Scripture, and concerning which there can be no dispute among the learned and the good, he knows that many truths, comparatively unimportant, lie on the surface of Scripture, and that disputants on all questions are looked on as learned and good by their own followers. If he says that they are the doctrines of the Trinity, and the Incarnation, he excludes from salvation multitudes who take the same rule for their guidance, and he includes multitudes who anathematize it. He denies, moreover, the essential character of doctrines most strongly insisted on, both in Holy Scripture and in the Creed.

But even if Protestants could draw up a catalogue of fundamental doctrines, their case would not be improved according to their own rule of faith, unless this catalogue could be authenticated from Holy Scripture. Now, Holy Scripture makes no such summary. If, again any

authority on earth were able to decide this question with infallible certainty, it would necessarily be equally infallible on other points ; and, consequently, it would be as much our duty to believe its statements on other matters as on this. So far as such an authority interpreted Christian doctrine to us, our duty would be to believe, and no further ; and thus we should be at once brought from the theory of fundamental, and non-fundamental truths to the Catholic doctrine of *implicit or explicit* faith.

Let the Apostles' Creed, or any other imaginable summary of leading truths, be put forward as comprising all "fundamental doctrines," and the same inherent fallacy will be found in all such rules. When we assert that the Creed is true, do we refer to its letter, or its meaning ? If to the meaning, then no one can in reality hold the Creed who denies what is legitimately deduced from it, and obstinately maintains a contrary doctrine. What is in the conclusion is in the premise ; and if the conclusion be denied, the premise must have been only held in appearance. The Church added the Nicene Creed to the Apostles', because, the early heretics professing to accept the latter, but rejecting its true sense, it became necessary to clear up whatever might be ambiguous. Again, the Athanasian Creed professes to be the true meaning of that part of the Nicene which relates to the Incarnation : and the creed of Pope Pius professes to convey the true meaning of the Nicene in that part which makes mention of the Church. Should their claims be true, no one can accept the Apostles' Creed in reality who rejects the later explanations of it.

Multitudes, it is sometimes answered, have gone to heaven without having ever heard of deductions from articles of the Apostles' Creed. Doubtless ;—but multitudes are also saved without an *explicit* knowledge of many of the articles included in that Creed. It is hard to say what is the least amount of *explicit* knowledge, which may, in special cases, be necessary for salvation. The reason of this is, that the whole faith exists latently in but a small part of it, if rightly received. The whole Law was propounded to man in one Commandment. Perfect love to God is the keeping of the whole Law. But, on the other hand, to offend wilfully in any part, is to offend in all. The whole faith was virtually included in St. Peter's confession ; but that confession would not

have been the true faith relatively to St. Peter, had he refused to accept any doctrine really contained in it.

By essential doctrines of Christianity is meant, not that which may possibly be sufficient for an individual, a quantity which must vary according to circumstance, but that which suffices for the general company of Christians. In this sense essential truth cannot stop short of the *entire revelation of God*, as already defined, or as the necessities of future times may require its definition. If, for instance, heretics professed to accept the article, "Who spoke by the Prophets," but yet restricted Inspiration to the Prophetic Books of Holy Scripture; and if ampler definitions were resorted to by the Church to vindicate the authority of the Bible, could it be conceded that any one rightly understood that article of the Creed who refused to admit it in the sense of the Church? Faith belongs to the will as well as to the mind; and if the will believes rightly, the mind must believe with more or less of detail, in proportion as it is instructed. Ignorance relates to the mind only: denial to the will.

To say that a part of what we hold is essential doctrine, and a part is not, amounts to this, that a part of it is faith, and a part is opinion; that a part is divine, and a part human; that a part is revealed religion, and a part philosophical conjecture. Now, the latter part, in this case, not only cannot be an essential part of the Christian faith, but cannot be any part of it. The object of Faith is Revelation. It must be essentially necessary to believe in the whole of what is revealed and propounded to us; and it can be no duty to believe in aught beside. A faith, part of which is divine, and part human, carries with it a "body of death," which must infect the nobler parts. Simplicity of faith cannot be attained by believing no more than the Church had defined before denial rendered definitions necessary. As well might one endeavour to cut a man down to the dimensions of a child.

The theory of fundamentals regards the Christian faith mechanically, as though it were a bundle of separable notions, instead of being a Truth at once one and manifold, potentially contained in a single statement, yet capable of being indefinitely expanded. It reduces the Church to the littleness of the individual, instead of imparting to the individual the stature and the faith of the whole mystic Body. It affects to give us false

immunities, while, in fact, it but deprives us of real privileges. It ignores the great truth that the same faith may exist implicitly or explicitly:—for, as for an implicit faith in the Bible only, as well might we profess to believe implicitly in whatever may be included in the “nature of things.” An abstract faith in that which, for the very reason that it is a book, and therefore impersonal, can never test our sincerity by requiring us to accept in detail what we profess to accept generally, is no faith at all. Such a faith in Holy Scripture, a Mahometan may profess, as well as a Christian. The Bible is not the print and paper, but the meaning of the Sacred Book. If instead of discerning that meaning, we contemplate in the text but our own reflection, finding in Holy Scripture simply what our several acquirements or associations have enabled us to bring to it, what remains but to admit that we have thus changed the word of God into the word of man, and destroyed, by mis-using, the divine gift? The Spirit is one, and the Word is one: but the religions which men profess to extract from that Word, by the aid of that Spirit, are so many, that Protestantism cannot answer the question, “What is Christianity?” Well may the devout Christian exclaim, “They have taken my Lord away, and I know not where they have laid Him.”

VIII. A rule of faith to be sound ought not only to give us a certain interpretation of Scripture, but also the amplest as well as the deepest. The Protestant rule must ever give us the *narrowest* and the *most superficial* exposition of Holy Writ. It invites every one to criticise for himself, and it is entitled only to regard as truth the results in which those who devoutly and sincerely use the rule in question agree. Now the same circumstances which produce diversities of opinion in one age will produce them in all ages. This is the cause of that which we observed at the outset, viz., that the secured results of Protestant theology are, and must be, a perpetually diminishing quantity. Protestantism was richest at first when, like the prodigal, it left its parent’s house with its separate portion. Ever since it has been spending, not gaining, or retaining; so that in the most Protestant country the most learned men have not only given up doctrine after doctrine in succession, but in multitudes of cases give up the

dogmatic principle itself, and assert that Christianity is but a sentiment, and that doctrines are but "oppositions of science falsely so called." They abandon reasoning processes in religion as but a snare, or, with a courage more fatal than their timidity, they discard logic in reasoning, forgetting that to reason logically is simply to reason honestly. That religion alone admits of progressive knowledge which includes in it also the principle of permanence. If we endeavour to build without the plummet and square, the new work will be ever getting out of the perpendicular, and tumbling over.

The Protestant rule of faith is bound to discard every deduction from a text which does not follow from it by a sequence apparently almost self-evident. The mind of the Church, on the other hand, can interpret on a wholly different principle, being free from the disturbing influences that affect isolated individuals. It deals with Holy Scripture accordingly as the Apostles do, deducing from texts meanings which do not follow by any obvious and necessary inference; in other words, seeing a meaning where an uninspired eye could see none. This is why the Church is sometimes accused of false reasoning, the fact being, that she often refers to a text rather as a motto than as the basis of a logical argument. From texts even the most vague she can draw certain conclusions, because she brings to the study of Holy Scripture that mature faith and spiritual mind which alone have the gift of discernment. The individual, on the other hand, is forced to discard all texts that are not plain. That which is to him practically the Bible becomes shrivelled up into a small space; and the Bible of his Protestant neighbour is in words alone the same as his.

The rule of private judgment can deal only with the surface of the Bible. Holy Scripture is a book of unfathomable depth, as well as of inexhaustible riches. It is possible that not a single chapter of it has yet been fully explored. A single text is often so many-sided that it reveals meaning beneath meaning, as it is more and more deeply searched. For this reason the mystical interpretation of Holy Scripture has ever been insisted on by Catholic theologians, as well as the literal. But if isolated individuals are to interpret it, they cannot trust themselves to a method of interpretation which, in that case, would be the work of fancy alone. Who, for instance,

could have felt certain, on his private judgment only, that the passage of the Red Sea was a type of baptism, that the history of Isack and Ishmael stood in a particular symbolic relation to Christianity, and that certain passages from the Psalms referred especially to our Lord? It is the apostolic Church only that can interpret Scripture according to the profounder method of the Apostles and yet with the same certainty. The contradictions of commentators on the book of Revelations sufficiently prove that the mystical interpretation, when carried out by individual caprice or imagination, is as unsafe a guide as omen and augury. Yet through the literal meaning alone the early Christian converts could hardly have discovered the new dispensation in the books of the Old Testament.

A comprehensive and manifold appreciation of Holy Scripture, like a deep one, is incompatible with the rule of private judgment. No text of Scripture can be explained by itself alone, or even with the aid of the context. It must be compared with other texts in other parts of the Bible. It might have pleased God to have presented us with all truths of moment, and all important moral principles in a compendious form, as in a creed, or a catechism, but it has pleased Him to do exactly the contrary. The great truths of religion are found scattered over the whole Bible. Nay, those truths, owing to their very greatness, are divided and subdivided, a portion being expressed in one text while another portion of the same truth is to be found elsewhere. Thus, in one place we read what might make us think that faith only is necessary, in another, that baptism is also a part of the Christian covenant. One set of texts instructs us that Christ is God, another that He is man. Figurative expressions are sometimes used, and in other places expressions which, if acted on literally, would lead us into superstition or error. The confusion which must result from not distinguishing between the literal and the figurative, or from not combining texts which are mutually supplemental, is not guarded against by any provision made in Holy Scripture itself, simply because God has given us another guide also. If we reject that guide we endeavour to sail without a chart. What right has a man to affirm that the words "This is my body" are to be taken figuratively, just as "I am the door" is a figurative expression, if he condemns the Socinians for in

like manner explaining away the plain words of Scripture, rather than believe that Christ was God when the senses could recognize in Him no more than man? Who can affirm that the words, "Drink ye all of it," addressed to the Apostles, make it invariably the right of the laity to receive the cup if the charge, "Do this in remembrance of me," does not equally give them the power of consecrating? Who can be sure that the prophecy about antichrist refers to Christian Rome, and that the glorious prophecies in Isaiah, describing the Church in its visibility, its universality, and its unity, do *not* refer to the Roman Catholic Church? How can we be sure that a parallel exists between the destruction of the brazen serpent and that of the images of the saints, yet be sure also that no analogy exists between the dispersed tribes who refused to worship at Jerusalem, and who, in losing unity, lost the faith, and the Protestant bodies who have set up rival altars? Who can be sure that Judah, selected from his brethren, and endowed with a promise, fulfilled at last by means which many might have thought human and accidental, was not a type of Peter selected from his brethren, and commanded to strengthen them? What is to be our guide in these matters? "The general tenor of Scripture," it will be answered. Just so. But on this principle a previous knowledge of *the whole* must determine the interpretation of *the parts*. Now such a knowledge is actually possessed by the Church, for She bears witness ever to what She had seen and known before one book of the New Testament was written. Individuals, on the other hand, who refuse to communicate in the divine knowledge of the Church, can become acquainted with Holy Scripture only by proceeding to a knowledge of the whole from a knowledge of the parts, that is, from a knowledge of what, on their own confession, must remain unknown. Men frequently speak as if the "general tenor" of the Scriptures were a thing easily understood, whereas a real appreciation of it, and of the general "analogy of the faith," is among the last attainments of the most mature Christian. What a Protestant mistakes for this broad knowledge is his own particular theological theory or prepossession, which is to him a key for the elucidation of all doubtful passages. The rule of private judgment, then, is essentially a *narrow*, a *superficial*, and a *crude* method of interpretation. If we use it we shall

lose not a portion merely, but far the larger portion of the meaning of Holy Writ. The draught which we secure must depend on the net which we use; and if we prefer our own to that of the Galilean fishermen we must take the consequences.

IX. A true rule of faith must be an unequivocal one. That of private judgment has ever been equivocal. In theory every one is by it invited to form his faith for himself; but, in fact, when his private judgment happens not to coincide with that of the community to which he belongs, he has been too frequently persecuted by the State, and almost always is denounced by the clergy as schismatical, or, at least, disloyal and unfilial. This is obviously unjust, for, on the principle of private judgment a Dissenter must have at least as good a right to abandon the national church, as the early Reformers had to abandon the Catholic; and a Protestant has as good a right to become a Catholic as a Catholic to become a Protestant. The most contradictory theories prevail also as to the nature of private judgment. The principle is commonly asserted in its most unmixed form; but attempts are also made to combine it with that of authority. The theories respecting this mixed authority are equivocal also. Sometimes it means the authority of some particular national or established church over its own members. Such authority must, of course, be limited, since no Protestant community pretends to infallibility; but whether the line of limitation is to be drawn by the sect, or by the individual, no one can say. At other times the Protestant theory of authority means that the inquirer is to stand perfectly free as regards the decisions of any existing community, but that he is to take into account the judgment of ancient fathers and councils in determining the sense of Holy Scripture. What fathers and councils, however he is to consult, on what principle he is to interpret them, and how far he is to be guided by their opinions except where they coincide with his own, the advocates of this theory have never determined. All such contending theories are, indeed, in one respect fatally identical, since private judgment, if admitted at all, must needs sit in the *ultimate* court of appeal; but while the common result of all must be uncertainty in divine things, the special doctrinal results to which each theory leads must be such

as are condemned by those who adopt the rival theories respecting the rule of faith. Private judgment thus is not one rule but several, disguised in the masquerade dress of a common name.

X. A true rule of faith must be consistent, not only with the maintenance of the faith, but with its propagation. Now the consequence of private judgment is to produce rival creeds, and it is utterly impossible that the heathen should be converted permanently, or on a large scale, by a religion propounded to them in contradictory versions. The sects differ, as we have seen, about matters regarded as essential by the contending parties. Such is the case even in the opposed schools included within the same establishment. To deny the "sacramental system" is heretical in the opinion of High-Churchmen, and to assert it is "soul-destroying" in that of Low-Churchmen. It is impossible, then, that a compromise should be made on such points, and equally impossible that the pagan world should be brought to agree with those who cannot agree among themselves. Again, where no organic principle of unity is recognized, as the source of mission and jurisdiction, it is impossible to prevent the missionaries of rival sects from occupying the same ground. Our Lord's prayer for unity among all that followed Him, a unity which He compares to that subsisting between Himself and His Father, was based upon the desire "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me;" and the connection between the success of missionary enterprise and unity in the faith and in the Church is obvious. Who can seriously imagine that even if the heathen nations could be evangelized, they could be retained in the faith by a religion consisting only of a doctrine or a sentiment, without a priesthood, an ecclesiastical rule, or a worship uniform and divine? If the Hindoos were converted, could the Christian faith be maintained among them by the principle of private judgment, and a church which pretended to be no more than a great Bible society? Would this suffice, also, for the Buddhist, the Mahometan, or the African races? It was not thus that Europe was evangelized; nor is it on Protestant principles that even the Protestant missionary maintains whatever scanty success attends his efforts. No sooner has he commenced his labours than he discerns that the Protestant rule of faith

can but suit a small portion of the human race under peculiar circumstances. He cannot, however, discard his principles at will, or prevent them from producing their natural results ; and accordingly we know, on the authority of Protestant missionaries, that the disputes among Christians are among the chief obstacles to the propagation of the Gospel. A momentary truce, (were it, indeed, possible to attain peace by the sacrifice of truth,) could, at most, produce but a momentary good. On the other hand, if the rival missionaries are to co-operate on a common principle, that principle, it is obvious, must be the one upon which alone permanent unity of faith is possible or even conceivable.

XI. A true rule of faith must not only teach us the truth, but secure us from error in matters of faith : in other words, it is necessary to hold the faith, not only in its fulness, but in its purity. Now, whatever truths the rule of private judgment may impart, experience proves that it does not guard us from many errors affirmed on the same authority, and believed with equal confidence. So closely are the truths and errors interwoven, that to remove but one of the latter, is an attempt resisted as a fatal aggression on all the former. Luther's special doctrine of justification, so stoutly repudiated by high-Church Protestants, seemed to him the gospel itself ; and the Puritans were as certain with respect to doctrines now denounced by most Protestants, both on moral and social grounds, as with respect to any part of their creed. To confuse truth and error thus, is to plant Babel in the heart of Jerusalem, and to erect false altars in the temple of the true God. Error, in the region of faith, is as poison mixed with food. In the Catholic Church it is hardly possible to confound matters to be believed *de fide* with mere theological opinions on questions not defined ; and errors in theological opinions, pretending to be nothing higher than opinion, no more vitiate or undermine the faith than errors on scientific subjects.

XII. A true rule of faith must preserve us from all fatal errors with respect to ordinances as well as to doctrine. Could any isolated individual have discovered from Scripture, as expounded by his own private judgment, that in baptism the sacrament would be made invalid by any form

of words, however devout and Christian, which did not include in terms the name of the Holy Trinity? Might not many, though firm believers in the Trinity, have overlooked the necessity of such an invocation at this particular moment? Anglican journals tell us of a parish in which water was for years dispensed with in baptism, only because the font was out of order, and because the clergyman supposed that as affusion represents immersion, so a mere motion of the hand may represent affusion. Is it lawful to mix unconsecrated with the consecrated wine in the Holy Eucharist? Is it, or is it not, competent for laymen to baptize? If so, have they, or have they not, the same power with respect to consecrating the Holy Eucharist? One sort of wine may be substituted for another. Would it be lawful also to substitute water for wine? Or is the admixture of water with wine *necessary*, as many of the most learned non-jurors maintained, for the due celebration of the Lord's supper? These are questions which can neither be answered by a phrase nor by a sneer. In the sacraments, certain external acts are essential, and others are non-essential. To which class a particular detail is to be referred, private judgment cannot know, with even an approach to certainty, because it has discarded the apostolic precept to "keep the traditions." Yet errors in such matters may be as fatal as error in doctrine or morals: as all persons must admit who believe that two of the sacraments at least are "generally necessary for salvation."

XIII. Above all, a rule of faith, if true, must be consistent with the exercise of Faith, and with the harmonious development of the other Christian virtues. In this respect the rule of private judgment is so defective, that if all acted upon it who imagine that to it they owe, under God, their religious knowledge, the very idea of Christian virtue must long since have perished. Private judgment, by engendering contradictory opinions in matters of faith, practically denies at once the *objective* character of revelation and the *certainty* of faith. It is, therefore, forced to ascribe to the principle of faith itself deficiencies inherent only in the individual not yet strong in faith, or placed in circumstances under which the exercise of faith is impossible. No sensible man will believe that certainty can belong to doctrines which are the perpetual subject of dispute among the best and ablest men he knows, and all of whom invoke

the aid of the same Spirit, while they apply the same rule to the same subject-matter. Common sense can recognise simple facts, in spite of evasion or equivocation: and an appeal as sharp and short as, "what then meaneth this bleating of sheep in mine ears?" will need as a reply, something more than a stereotyped phrase about "agreement in essentials." Confronted by contradictions, yet shrinking from the abyss of conscious infidelity, religious belief declines from certainty to probability; and too often those alone feel positive respecting their conclusions, whose temper makes them equally positive concerning other matters not the subject of revelation at all, as their own individual salvation, or the truth of their political convictions. When faith is changed into opinion, the rock on which the fabric of the Christian life should be reared crumbles into sand. Another and less sincere class of thinkers affirm that they are certain with respect to their conclusions, but that others may be equally certain of opposite conclusions; and that no one has a right to brand his neighbour's opinion as erroneous. This is to substitute taste for probable opinion, and practically to deny, not only the certainty of faith, but the objective existence of Truth itself. Truth upon this theory would be relative, not absolute, like sensations; and Theism and Atheism would stand upon the same level. A third class throw themselves on the inner light of Reason, as the Puritan throws himself on the Spirit, affirming that Reason is a universal endowment incapable of deceiving. But the philosopher of this school cannot deny that revealed religion includes matters of fact, as well as ideas of the pure reason; and again that reason, far from being able to determine as to the former, cannot prove that the truths included in its own province possess an actual as well as an ideal existence. Neither can he shut his eyes to the fact that other persons, possessed of the same universal gift, have arrived at conclusions exactly the opposite of his own; and that his own convictions have also varied, as to the gravest subjects, at different periods of his mature life. Once more, even though reason were indeed infallible, he must be capable of misusing it; as when a man makes some fatal mistake in casting up a sum in arithmetic. He has, therefore, no means of determining whether it be he or his neighbour who is under delusion. This species of uncertainty, would, in fact, be our condition, even in mathemati-

cal science, if its professors arrived at opposite conclusions. In all these schools alike, then, private judgment leads a man in the direction of scepticism, unless he chooses to fling himself into a philosophic fanaticism, and ignore what he knows.

In losing Certainty, Faith loses its *essential* character, not merely an attribute or an ornament. Divine faith is a theological virtue, and a supernatural gift which enables man to believe and confess with a knowledge, obscure in kind, but absolutely certain, the truth which God has revealed, and on the ground that God has revealed it. The intuitions of reason never could constitute divine faith, because, however certain they may be, as in mathematics, the faculty is not a supernatural gift infused by the Holy Ghost; and the knowledge it imparts is not accepted on the ground of its being revealed by God. For the same reason the knowledge derived from the senses belongs not to Faith, whether such knowledge be certain or uncertain. *Human* Faith, likewise, another mode of knowledge, being founded on merely human testimony, belongs not to the order of grace, and thus differs essentially from the gift of divine Faith, although it exercises its own subordinate part in sacred things, as well as a principal part in the affairs of ordinary life; holding in the natural order a place in many respects analogous to that which divine Faith occupies in the supernatural. From all these modes of knowledge divine Faith differs; and likewise from that of Vision, which belongs to the kingdom of glory, not to that of grace. Faith comes to us by grace, and with the co-operation both of the human mind and will, to both of which it belongs. For the exercise of Faith we require *two* things;—the internal gift itself, and an external guide, either God Himself, or a prophet commissioned by God, and challenging us in His name—a prophet by whom that gift of faith may be directed to its proper objects. It was thus that our Lord stood up among His disciples, and that the Apostles, when the Spirit had descended upon them, at once appealed to, and directed, the faith of the early Christians. They still continue to address us through that Apostolic Church, Catholic, and yet One, in which the unity of the Apostolic College, united ever with Peter, lives and rules. Without the internal grace the external guide would exist in vain; and without that guide the grace must remain dormant.

That Church confesses Christ, speaks with His authority, and thus challenges Faith, proposing to it its one appropriate object, viz., the Christian Revelation in its completeness and purity. The whole doctrine is thus held, either explicitly or implicitly: it is held as revealed by God; and it is held by a supernatural Faith, which thus lays the foundation of the supernatural life. Reason does its part, for it vindicates the divine origin and authority of the Church, by means of historic testimony and external evidence, as complete as the nature of such reasoning admits of, and as stringent as that which determines our actions in matters of human duty or interest, where the will is not averse. The rest must be done by Faith, which crowns and authenticates right reason, just as grace consummates nature; and the exercise of Faith is rendered practicable by the presence and challenge of the Apostolic Church, as the divine Witness of a truth delivered once for all, and as its commissioned expositor. We are addressed as reasonable beings; but not as beings for whom reason is sufficient. The divine mission of the Church is evinced to reason by the "Notes" of the Church, as well as by its teaching, its miracles, and the permanent miracle of its sustained existence—just as the mission of the Apostles was evinced by their miracles and by their teaching. It was, of course, always intellectually *possible* to attribute those miracles to evil spirits or to impostors: and it is equally possible now to meet the claims of the Church by remarking that false Churches have also claimed to speak in God's name. Were such a rejoinder not possible, revelation would be *scientifically proved* by reason alone, instead of resting on a Faith of which reason supplies the intellectual *motives*. We thus perceive the fallacious character of that argument which affirms that even an infallible Church would be no certain guide to us, if its claims were not demonstrated by a process of such scientific rigour that no man could resist it. Equally sophistical is it to urge that if the individual can decide for himself on the claims of the Church, he must also be competent to form his opinions on all other points of theology. As well might we say that whosoever can select a safe guide must have sagacity enough also to find his path across the mountains without a guide. Religion is built upon faith: but faith needs certain conditions for its exercise. It is now as it has ever been. Now, as in

the apostolic age, an object is presented upon which Faith, if it exists, is capable of finding a resting-place. The Church comes to us as sent by God. We recognize her claims, humanly by reason, and divinely by faith, because God, who has commissioned her, imparts to us the gift of faith; and thus we can exercise the faculty of spiritual discernment. That the individual should believe as she believes, animated as he is by the same Spirit, no more implies a bondage than that the hand should obey the brain. God gives the faith: the Church, through the Communion of Saints, directs it. The same divine Spirit acts at once in the Church, (which He seals with His holy unction, preserves in unity, and leads into all truth,) and in the heart of the individual, which He kindles, illumines, purifies, and delivers from the tyranny of self.

It is not the ultimate uncertainty alone in which an enquiring mind is left by the rule of private judgment, which proves that rule to be inconsistent with Faith. The *method* it involves for the attainment of knowledge is not that of Faith. For Faith it substitutes the principle of scientific inquiry, directing it, however, to the book of revelation, not that of nature, for its subject-matter. Let us consider this false method on its moral side. As long as we are enquiring, we must keep our minds in a state of judicial *impartiality*. While, therefore, we are labouring to ascertain whether there are any sacraments or not, and what is the true doctrine of justification, we are all the time exercising on those important questions, the virtue, not of Faith, but of impartiality. Who is to inform the student as to the limits between such enquiry and infidelity? May he not have to enquire also as to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation? During that enquiry he is a sceptic, not a Christian; and he is little likely to reach the virtue of Faith through the habit of disbelief.

Protestants frequently think that Faith is exclusively the faculty of spiritual discernment, which is but one of its attributes, and not always the one earliest developed. Submission, self-abnegation; these are also qualities implied in the exercise of true Faith. As little children only can we enter into the kingdom of heaven, and as such only can we abide in it, and advance in it. Opinion *asserts*; Faith *confesses*. Assertion includes *self-assertion*. Confession acknowledges God by forgetting *self*. God only

can rightly assert Himself: in man, who is but a Creature, such a habit is based on delusion, and involves the sin of pride, in a form the more perilous for being latent. Pride is the very instinct of Reason, when it works by itself in divine things; and in taking self as a ground of spiritual knowledge, and as our guide to God, man, as it were, creates his own creator. The higher we soar, the more we need humility. For this reason the intuitions of Faith are allowed to remain obscure, though certain; and docility, as well as spiritual discernment, belongs to Faith. Christianity reveals to us the doctrine of a divine sacrifice and a divine condescension; and it is only through this constant discipline of self-sacrifice and self-abasement, in the contemplative, as well as in the practical part of man's being, that such a doctrine can be brought home to his heart and mind.

It is humility that imparts this character to faith; and humility itself is maintained in us by obedience, not to God only, but to man also for God's sake. The sin of the fallen angels is supposed to have consisted in their refusing to worship God in His Incarnation, when that mystery was prophetically revealed to them: and in men also the trial of humility is to obey one who seems but like oneself, and who yet bears the Divine seal. Docility is always, in Holy Scripture, the attribute of faith. Such docility will often look like credulity; but it is thus that every thing Christian wears a double aspect, as seen by the Christian or by the world. That is no Christianity which escapes its reproach. Those who despised our Lord must despise His Church also, and His servants, who most resemble Him. They class His Church with impostors, because false religions, or corruptions of the patriarchal religion, have also claimed that infallibility which must, as the instinct of the human race ever felt, be an attribute of the true one; and they appeal from it to the Bible, forgetting that the false religions have claimed their sacred books as well as their divine priesthood. It is thus that they class what they fancy the credulity of the Catholic with that of the Hindoo; forgetting that Holy Writ is full of examples of that which might seem credulity, had not Divine Providence and Divine Grace, (the two hands of God in the world), been pleased thus to co-operate in leading the humble and believing to divine truth. It was thus that the Apostles followed our Lord at a word, and that those who heard them

desired that even their shadows might pass over them, and were cured of their diseases. Credulity itself is but one of the lower forms of human faith. Docility is the initiative form of divine faith. Through it we come to Christ as little children ; and, in the Christian, the child lives ever on in the man. The martyrs surely did not lack spiritual discernment ; yet none were more remarkable for docility, and the spirit of submission. It was Arius, and the other heretics, who branded their humility as superstition.

The will, as well as the mind, is the seat of faith. To the latter discernment belongs, to the former submission ; accordingly that only is heresy which includes the sin of the will ; and conversely a belief which does not include the submission of the will is unprofitable, even when it chances to be sound. The authority of the Church is the organ through which Divine grace, shed abroad in the heart, trains man in the habit of submission. Obedience is not a principle merely, to be learned by precept, but a habit to be taught by providential circumstance and divine institutions. It is thus that our moral being, in its own inferior sphere, is shaped and moulded, not by precept only, but by circumstance, such as the civil power, parental rule, social traditions, the weakness of childhood, the limitations of knowledge, the need of joint action, and therefore of subordination. Private judgment excludes the corresponding discipline in the spiritual sphere, and leaves room, on the largest supposition, for no more than an implicit faith in the Bible itself. Now, apart from the consideration that the same will which accepts the Bible rejects other gifts authenticated as divine by the same authority, it must be remembered that a book, though divine, is a book still, and can discharge that office only in the covenant of grace which God has assigned to it. When questioned a book must answer with the voice of the questioner himself. It cannot prevent him from mistaking for a divine voice the echo of his own. It cannot correct his misapprehensions, divide between the dross and the sterling metal in his interpretations, abash his presumption, restrain his precipitation, disclose the tenor of the whole before he has mastered the parts, prevent him from selecting texts according to the law of a false theory, and from distributing the subject-matter of inquiry by the method of an erroneous tradition. It cannot prevent him

from finding in it what he brought to it, and trampling under foot the truths or the admonitions he most needs. It cannot enable him to distinguish between the Written Word and his own version of it, between the "mind of the Spirit" and his own mind; and therefore it cannot authenticate his own convictions, even when most firmly held, with that seal of Divine teaching, through which alone they become the subject of *faith*. The loss thus sustained is not less than infinite. The strength of the chain is the strength of its weakest link; and a divine book, with but a human interpreter, is not a *Divine revelation*. The principle of private judgment thus intercepts, by the interposition of a fallible medium, the direct communication between God and the spiritual mind of man.

Still more fatally does the same principle affect the Will. If a country, without judges or rulers, possessed laws, together with a vast legal literature for the interpretation of them, a literature submitted to the private judgment of individuals, habits of loyalty could never be trained, though every citizen became as learned in the intricacies of the statute book as village attorneys are now. Through the instrumentality, on the other hand, of the Church, the mind of the Christian is made subject to a regenerate will, and that again to the will of God unequivocally expressed through an interpreter, speaking "with authority." Every fresh accession of knowledge is a fresh act of submission; and, literally, "every thought" is thus "brought into the obedience of Christ." The faith thus generated is seasoned and vivified by all the affections of the regenerate heart, which are addressed by the Church as by a mother, and trained for their proper functions—that of being the handmaids of faith. The apostle addresses his converts as "my little children, of whom I travail again till Christ be found within you." Thus are now addressed the children of her only who claims apostolic authority, and who does not fear to command them in Christ's name. A book cannot thus address us, nor an institute, however venerable, if founded on private judgment, or human authority, and one that denounces as blasphemous the claims to infallibility. In the Church obedience rises to a *sacramental* dignity, by being directed to God, through an external Representative, His symbol, and His organ. Through such obedience the spiritual insight of faith is exercised without danger of human or demoniacal delusions. Through such authority

the Church is able to show love toward her children by imparting to them safety and peace, not by discarding her own sacred prerogatives, and surrendering to them seeming privileges, which are not hers to give. Therefore it is that her children love her ; and that those who have ever loved her most, and most prized her authority, are those recognized even beyond her pale as her greatest saints—those who have had the deepest insight into the “glorious liberty” of the Gospel.

The rule of private judgment divests faith likewise of its vitality, and its power, by chilling the ardour of strong minds. In such minds the freezing sense of insecurity, produced by the impossibility of discriminating between faith and imaginative illusions, will reduce the religious sentiment to a low and sordid tone, mistaken for the golden mean. Enthusiasm will, in such circumstances, commonly be the attribute only of the light and injudicious ; and as such it will do as much harm as good, for in religion, as in all things, no substitute can be found for good sense. A community which cannot eliminate doubt from its theological creed has its vulnerable point, and feels it. Heroic virtue would be but a peril or a hindrance to it. It has admitted the formula of nature into the region of supernatural truth, and substituted “Peradventure” for “Amen.” It becomes at once reduced and transposed ; and its very truths lose their substance while they retain their name. Its raptures are but poetry, its dogma but theory, its antiquity but pedantry, its forms but formality, its freedom but licence, its authority but convention, its zeal but faction, its sobriety but sloth. Such a faith must needs instal reason in the supreme place. Such a Church may not rule ; for it cannot rule by serving.

The rule of private judgment has lost sight, not only of the vastness and depth of Holy Scripture, and the objectivity of revelation, but of the vast and multiform nature of that Christian virtue of which faith is the root. Faith has not only a special function with reference to the justification of the individual, but is also the universal bond between the redeemed race and God. It must therefore affect the whole soul, and be the health of every part, penetrating all the virtues, and imparting to them its own unity and stability. It is an adamant which God diffuses through our whole being. It must enlighten the mind,

erect the will, warm and purify the heart, live in every affection, kneel in our humility, endure in our patience. It must from the first contain the element of the infinite, yet admit of infinite increase. Such cannot be its character if it boasts that it needs not the brethren, that it is entitled to its own inheritance, and that it can act for itself.

The existence of a cycle of supernatural virtues, all founded upon faith, and constituting the Christian life, still maintains, indeed, a traditional place in Protestant theology, however little belief is reposed in that Heroic Sanctity which is their practical embodiment. Except, however, as correlative portions of one vast system, they have little meaning, and when deprived of their solid foundation they totter to their fall. The various elements of the supernatural world, as of the natural, correspond with each other, and must exist in harmony and due subordination, or not at all. Faith is the immovable axis of that world ; and the light that illumines it is the knowledge of God. Having lost the true idea of faith, Protestantism has too generally lost also the idea of the supernatural world which it supports, and of the divine knowledge by which that world is irradiated. Insensibly men have drifted away from a true estimate of divine Knowledge, as something supernatural, hallowing, elevating, the source and the health of all the Christian virtues. This is one reason why theology is now disparaged even by the devout. Men who would hardly avow as much, regard all such knowledge as but a series of logical positions, at most subjectively true, or relatively useful, the result of much idle curiosity, and the cause of much mischievous contention. Such an estimate would not be unjust, if our knowledge of divine things came indeed from beneath, not from above. Speculations which had been useful as an intellectual exercise, might well, if of merely human origin, become a spiritual tyranny, when hardened into dogma. Such an estimate of divine knowledge proceeds from that philosophy which regards *belief*, in religious matters, as a something less certain than *knowledge*, instead of a something greater—a knowledge in which the will, as well as the mind, bears its part. It is, however, of the highest importance to observe, that according to our estimate of Christian knowledge, must be our estimate of Christianity as a whole. It is the instinct, and all but the necessity of a half-materialist age

to invert the process through which the mutual relations of spiritual and of sensuous things are regarded, interpreting the higher by the lower, not the lower by the higher. If this spurious method of interpretation be adopted, it must be used consistently. If faith mean no more than opinion, the whole Christian scheme must shrink into but a complex piece of intellectual mechanism. The idea of God must dwindle proportionately. His love can be but benevolence; His paternity but a metaphor; His justice but an arbitrary formula; to impute jealousy or wrath to Him will seem but a dream of the envious, or the angry: to believe that He works for His glory, will be stigmatized as imputing to Him human littleness. In short, according to this scheme of inverted thought, God Himself would be but Man, flung to a distance, and magnified by an optic glass; and all our knowledge of divine things would consist but of human knowledge misapplied. The same fatal error depraves our estimate of religious knowledge in its moral and in its intellectual relations. The same misconception which prevents our regarding divine knowledge as certain, and, therefore, considering faith as an organ of certainty, hinders us also from recognizing such knowledge as spiritual and vital. A few words will suffice to indicate this truth, though to illustrate it adequately a volume would be required.

If man were to find out God by his proper strength, then, indeed, as man is frail and imperfect, his knowledge of God would by necessity share that imperfection, and would remain (1st) doubtful, (2nd) subjective, (3rd) barren. If, on the other hand, man's knowledge of divine things comes from God, it must share the character of God, and be (1st) certain, (2nd) objective, (3rd) fruitful. Probable knowledge on matters that belong to the supernatural order is not knowledge, but conjecture; and that such knowledge can never add a cubit to our spiritual stature, is a fact which reason asserts, and which faith does not care to deny. Yet there is something in man's lower nature which sometimes makes him prefer the lower to the higher knowledge, and found a boast upon what is, in reality, but the poverty and nakedness of unassisted humanity. His pride prefers the position of a discoverer to that of a recipient. The propensity is indicated by the predilection in modern times for that supposed discovery, natural theology, which spins volumes of pseudo-science out of a single analogy between a world and

a watch. It is the same instinct in a less developed form, which, assuming the truth of the bible, seeks a key to its interpretation in private judgment, rather than in the divine witness of the Church. The very boast of this false method is its confutation. An inductive method in religion must needs be a hybrid and a monster, for the same reason as a theological method in natural philosophy would be such, namely, from want of conformity between the method and the subject-matter submitted to it. Knowledge which, either in its origin, or in our mode of deducing it from its original fount, is merely human, for that very reason is not divine: and if it claims to be religion, it has the fatal defect of not being revelation, just in proportion as it is discovery. It is not difficult to see that the same circumstance which makes such knowledge inconsistent with the essence, makes it likewise incompatible with the end of religion. If our religious knowledge reached us by the method of empirical science, its results would be empirical; if it were accorded to us through a series of intuitions, like those of abstract science, it would master the will, and so annihilate probation. In all such cases alike the knowledge which comes from below must be shorn of its moral and spiritual relations, and must prove incapable of lifting up the soul, even more than of irradiating the mind of man.

But far different is it with that Knowledge which comes from above, of which Christ is the source, and the Church of Christ the channel. Such knowledge of God is an effluence from God, a light sent forth into the face of human kind, from Him the Father of Lights, and from that perfect Manhood which reigns in heaven. Our sunrise is His glory manifested; and this is the reason that it comes "with healing on its wings." It has a spiritual efficacy because it comes from Him who is a Spirit, and must be worshipped, not only "in Spirit," but "in truth." It is deiform in character, and therefore it is deific. Its nature corresponds with the Divine attributes, and transfigures that human intelligence, which is capable of receiving it only because it was itself originally formed after the Divine Image. If it does not include a quality corresponding with the Divine attributes of certainty and fixedness, it must fall equally short of the Divine character in all other respects. It cannot be spiritual, or pure, or eternal, or absolute, like Him, if it be dubious like us. If, on the

other hand, our knowledge be certain, as coming from God, then indeed it must also be sanctifying.

The knowledge which comes from on high includes properties distinct from those that address the intelligence, as light possesses other qualities, chemical, magnetic, and vital, beside those that address the eye. Such knowledge is therefore capable of constituting an instrument of genuine communication between the Creator and the creature. This is the reason why it is commonly spoken of in Holy Writ, as the characteristic type of religion. The knowledge that comes from man, on the other hand, even though it related to divine things, could no more ripen the spiritual harvests than lamps and torches could mature the fruits of the earth. Such knowledge may be a literature or a philosophy; but it lacks the *differentia* of religion, properly so called. It constitutes no living bond between the Creator and His creature. It is a devout literature with the sects whose knowledge of divine things is founded on human and fallible criticism: among establishments it adds a religious sanction to social order: and it lives as a mystic philosophy among psychologists who look for God only in their own souls, and who know not that what is deepest within us is descried only through the light that comes from above. A Religion it is not, except so far as it contradicts its own rule of faith, and as an under-current of ancient and divine tradition, flowing beneath the brittle ice of human speculations, enriches dead opinions with something of the character of faith.

That knowledge of God, then, alone, is sacred and sanctifying, which is authentic, and comes from God. It alone is supernatural, and therefore stands on the level of Christianity; is vital, and therefore capable of realizing the Christian aim. It elevates and exercises all the virtues. Coming from the heights it sounds the depths, and therefore presupposes submission in the very act of recipiency. It carries God with it in every ray. He it is who exists in those beams, and in each of them, sacramented in light. This is the knowledge capable of expanding into that higher knowledge, which is called the beatific vision. Such is the reward reserved for faith, and for the obedience included in faith. Opinion, on the other hand, has no such latent property; for mere nature includes no principle through which man is capable of conversing with spiritual realities. *—* *as “little systems have their day,”*

and amuse us while here below ; but they cease where “ knowledge,” that is, human forms of perception, cease. The world has played with them till it is tired of its play-thing ; it is now sick of their petty restraints, and peevish inconstancy. It suspects the existence of a world mightier than itself, deeper, loftier, more lasting—the supernatural world. It knows that if such a world exists, the way of access to it can neither be found in the statute book, nor in the volumes of the scribes, nor amid the eddies of public opinion.

ART. II.—1.—*The Creed of Christendom: its Foundations and Superstructure.* By W. RATHBONE GREG. 8vo. J. Chapman, London, 1853.

2. *Pensées sur le Christianisme, Preuves de sa Vérité.* Par M. JOSEPH DROZ, Membre de l'Academie Françoise. Bruxelles, 1844.

3. *Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien.* Par le même. Paris, Jules Renouard, Libraire, Rue de Tournon. 1848.

THE controversy with Deism is one which should, at the present time, especially engage the attention of British Catholics. No one is more sanguine than ourselves as to the ultimate triumph of Catholicity in this empire ; none hailed with more confidence the great religious movement of 1833, or followed with intenser interest its successive phases. But while from this break-up of Anglicanism, and the general dissolution of Protestantism throughout Europe, the better spirits are seeking a refuge in the Catholic Church, others of less happy dispositions plunge into the abyss of infidelity. Thus will a deadly struggle ensue between the Church and irreligion. Not that we are apprehensive of the result—not that we think the British Catholics will have to pass through the same fiery ordeal as their brethren of France and Germany in the last century. The strength of infidelity is broken—the prestige that surrounded her has vanished ;—the history of the last sixty

years has revealed her utter impotence, and her hideous deformity. Judging from the moral and intellectual movement now going on in Europe, we feel persuaded that, in the approaching conflict we advert to, learning and talent, as well as numbers and property in this country, will vastly preponderate on the side of the Church; but still a conflict there will certainly be.

But besides this general source of infidelity here pointed out, there are other more special ones, against which the Catholics of the empire must be particularly put on their guard. The first of these is the openly or covertly unbelieving press, which of course, in proportion as infidelity spreads, will increase in talent and influence. English literature, which, under the Restoration, and during the early part of the eighteenth century, had been in part sullied by obscenity and irreligion, was gradually purged of these stains in the latter half of that century. Deism, with a few exceptions, had, for the last seventy years, possessed no very brilliant talents; and on the whole, its influence over the higher classes had been greatly declining. Much of this happy change must be ascribed to the French Revolution, which revealed to the most thoughtless, or the most prejudiced, the frightful results, moral and social, of infidelity. Much, too, must be imputed to the workings of an excellent Constitution, which withdrew the upper ranks from frivolous pursuits, engaged their minds with concerns of state; and by charging them with the responsibilities of power, made them keenly alive to the social necessity of Religion. Hence impiety had sunk down more and more into the lower classes.

But the case is now vastly altered, when the contest with Catholicism has roused the Anglican Church from her long torpor, and made her own children sift her foundations; when their faith has been shaken; and those who are not prepared to embrace the truth, will at least fall back into a more consistent form of unbelief. The latitudinarianism of a Hoadley, a Watson, and other Anglicans of the last century, arrested for a time, has been now taken up and developed by the party of Arnold, and of Whately, and will no doubt be pushed to the furthest extremes of Rationalism. A new Pantheistic school, possessing some distinguished talents, and fed by the literature of Germany and America, has lately risen up amongst us,

and finds its organ in the Westminster Review. The other sects of Protestantism will, in course of time, be drawn into this vortex of unbelief.

Hence the Protestant literature most accessible to Catholics, such as histories, memoirs, novels, and periodicals, will become more and more infected with the taint of infidelity. And where only the shallow and thousand-times-refuted calumnies of an effete Calvinism were looked for, far more dangerous sophisms will have to be encountered. Hence the Catholic mind must be set on its guard against these new perils.

Nor should we close our eyes to the dangers, by which, in these days, the education of our youth is beset. The tendency to exclude, or to reduce to a minimum, that religious element, which every well minded man must feel to be its true foundation, is developing itself more markedly every day. Constituted as they now are, and destitute of the control, or even the supervision of the authorities of the Church, which a sounder and more generous policy should have taught the government to desire and even to court, we cannot but anticipate great danger from the Queen's Colleges in Ireland. In a late memorial to the Pope, the Irish Catholic Prelates complained that many a Catholic in Trinity College, Dublin, and in the University of Edinburgh, had made shipwreck of faith and morals. The same calamitous results, although probably in a different direction, will certainly not fail to attend the teaching in the Colleges. Too many, we fear, will leave their halls indifferent about all religion; but the greater part of the students, even if they retain the religious sentiments of their childhood, will enter the world without any adequate religious training, unprepared and unguarded against the blandishments of pleasure, and the seductions of error. The evil may be partially counteracted in the new Catholic University; still, now that they are under the ban of the Church, and deprived of even the shadow of the protection which might be hoped from her interposition, supported as the new Colleges are by government, and holding out, as they do to youth, many pecuniary advantages, they will enlist, it is to be feared for some time to come, but too many students in the Catholic body.

Hand in hand with the peril with which the new educational systems are fraught, goes a more partial, but yet a

very similar one, from the practice of mixed marriages, especially in the present condition of the religious mind of the Protestant community. In Catholic countries, Deists break entirely with the Church; but in Protestant states, like Germany and England, they entitle themselves, in the former Lutherans, and in the latter Unitarians, and sometimes Anglicans. Hence their real religious sentiments can with difficulty be discovered. Professing great liberality of sentiment in matters of religion, and a great horror for all sectarian intolerance, they will often express themselves fairly and even kindly, in regard to the Catholic Church. Hence such plausible language will often deceive the fair sex in the Catholic community; they will rashly contract an alliance with men whom they fondly believe to be sincere Anglicans,* perhaps sentimental Puseyites, but whom, too late, they will discover to be infidels at heart. These men will engage to bring up the children of such marriages in the Catholic faith; but by their bad conduct, and ill-suppressed scepticism, will blight the germs of faith in those youthful hearts; impiety, like a serpent, will creep in by the Catholic fireside.

Another channel whereby infidelity may be easily transfused into our Catholic body, is its connexion with the extreme and almost revolutionary school of politics. The mischief, even purely religious, which, for the last fifty years, this connexion has inflicted on the Catholic community throughout the empire, it is not here the place to point out. And although that influence is passing away, and a healthier code of principles will keep pace with the Catholic reaction, yet, until the Church has gathered in the masses, the school to which we allude, whether in power or, in opposition, will carry on a deadly conflict with the principles of social order. British and Irish Catholics, from the peculiarity of their circumstances and position, are especially obnoxious to its influence. But those influences cannot, to use the mildest expression, be very propitious to the growth of Catholic feeling,

* As an illustration in point, we may observe that many an honest Scotch father of a family has intrusted his children to the care of a German Protestant tutor, thinking he would bring them up in the Reformed creed, when, to his utter surprise, they have turned out Rationalists.

when we bear in mind that a large proportion of its members, both English and Scotch, are Unitarians, or Deists, or men utterly indifferent to religion; that their journals are the too faithful expositors of those sentiments; and that their hostility to the Catholic Church abroad, and of late in this country also, if less violent, is more insidious than that exhibited in the organs of Anglicans and Dissenters. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." What effect must the habitual perusal of "*the Examiner Newspaper*," for example, have on a lukewarm, or even imperfectly educated Catholic? Any but a favourable one, we should conceive. These extreme political doctrines, too, run directly counter to those which the Church has sanctioned, directly or indirectly, by her teaching and her practice. Its dogma of the sovereignty of the people, which renders all government, even a democratic one, unstable, and therefore violent and tyrannic—its hostility to all ecclesiastical endowments, as well as to the political influence of the clergy—its hatred to monarchy and to aristocracy—the unbridled licentiousness of the press, which it proclaims as an inalienable right*—the coarse, rationalistic view it takes of the rise and growth of civil communities, as well as of the end and functions of the civil power;—these naturally inspire its followers with aversion for the history of Christian states, throw them into false political abstractions, fill them with disgust for the past, and a spirit of restless, morbid speculation as to the future. This uncatholic state of mind, it is needless to observe, leaves the Catholic who habitually indulges it, more open to the wiles of heresy and unbelief.

Such being the case, our readers cannot be surprised that we should urge on British Catholics attention to the controversy with Deism. True, it will never exert the same influence as in former times, and Pantheism is that form of unbelief which scientific men, who have abandoned Christianity, now usually take up. But Deism is the refuge of those unhappy apostates, not stupid and wicked enough to plunge into Atheism and Materialism, and not subtle enough to thread the intricate mazes of the

* This principle was condemned in the *Encyclica* of 1832, issued by his Holiness Pope Gregory XVI. This licentiousness must not be confounded with the liberty of the press.

Pantheistic philosophy. The negative objections, too, which Deism raises against Christianity, are common to all forms of infidelity; and therefore its study will always be a matter of interest and importance. Before noticing the two little treatises at the head of our paper, we shall string together some cursory remarks on the absurdities and self-contradictions of this class of unbelievers.

Deism, which affects to exalt man to the dignity of an angel, either renders him a hypocrite, or degrades him to the level of the brute. For, as it proscribes all sacrifice, all public prayer, the Deist who, as Gibbon relates of the Roman philosophers in the times of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, takes part in the national worship of his country, performs an act of cowardice and gross hypocrisy. Or if, true to his principles, he abstain from all participation in public prayer and worship, he then falls into what the great Bishop of Meaux so well calls, a disguised or practical atheism; for where public worship is disdained, private prayer will be at best but fitful and irregular, and, for the most part, neglected. But what a degraded being is man without prayer! * * * * *

Deism professes to guide its followers exclusively by the light of reason, and the internal voice of conscience; yet, of all religious systems, it is precisely the one which exercises the least control over the affections of the heart, and is most indulgent to sins of thought and desire, which are the root of all others. Can a more palpable contradiction be witnessed? * * * * *

Deism professes to restore natural religion as the most perfect system of theology. Yet, even with regard to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul—the foundation of all religious hope, as the existence of God is the groundwork of all religious faith—its followers are not unanimous; some only regarding it as certain, others as merely probable, others again as doubtful.

But how can that system be called a religion, which establishes so loose, uncertain a connection between the present and a future life? And how can it, least of all, be called *natural religion* when it runs counter to the voice of nature, the *vox naturæ*, as Cicero calls the universal consent of nations, so loudly attesting the doctrine of the soul's immortality, as well as every other dogma of primitive revelation? The modern Deist is without excuse; he possesses an accumulation of evi-

dence on this matter, which was not within the reach of the ancient Academician. For if he will obstinately close his eyes against the fulness of light which Christianity has thrown upon this, as on every other primeval doctrine; still, the great progress of anthropology, the discovery of America, the circumnavigation of the globe, and the newly discovered literatures of India, China, and other remote countries of the East, furnish him with far more abundant proofs of the perpetuity and universality of this belief, than existed in the time of Cicero.* * *

Deism, conscious of its utter impotence over the masses, and well knowing that the populace, whom it has taught to reject and deride Christianity, will plunge into the grossest Atheism and the most grovelling Materialism, calls itself the religion of the enlightened few. Yet with the same breath it proclaims itself the religion of nature. Can there be a grosser contradiction? Natural religion must be the one adapted to every class of mankind, and to every description and variety of the human race. Natural and universal are correlative terms. Thus does Deism stand self-condemned; and the absurd inconsistency of its pretensions proves their utter nullity. * *

Had conscience been destined by the Creator to be the sole moral guide of man, then her enunciations would have been clearer and more definite; but her warnings and intimations, from their very vagueness, presuppose a Divine revelation, and a system of external ordinances and sanctions. She is louder in reproof than in admonition. How often are her accents drowned amid the din of the world, the tumult of passion, and the sophistries of perverted reason; but in the hour of solitude, and after the momentary indulgence of passion is over, then that still small voice makes itself heard. Conscience, since the Fall, is a muffled instrument, whose notes are often indistinct. Sin hath deadened those once clear, shrill tones.

Where the Christian sacrifice is abolished, there all heroic charity ceases; but where all public prayer and worship are set aside, there even almsgiving will cease. This is the case in Deism. By breaking up all community of prayer, by destroying the mediation of the priesthood, by severing the bonds of spiritual connection between men, Deism dries up the spirit of benevolence, and alienates man from his fellows. Though it sometimes affects a philanthropy

as empty as it is ostentatious, the pride it fosters is inimical to charity. Misanthropy is its prevailing mark.

* * * * *

Deists often term the Catholic religion, which more than any other inspires cheerfulness and contentment, a *gloomy* superstition. A singular charge this on the part of those, whose writings, from Rousseau to Byron, are pervaded by gloom! Indeed, a recent distinguished convert,* speaking from sad experience, declares that the gloomy despondence on the youthful brow is one of the surest symptoms that the canker of infidelity lies at the heart. * * *

M. de Bonald calls Mohammedanism a gross and sensual Deism, which, like the latter in Europe, promotes pride, covetousness, and voluptuousness in the East. The comparison is, however, too flattering to Deism. In fact, the Mohammedan religion, false and anti-christian as it is, recognizes the existence of the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian Dispensations, while it claims for itself the rank of a higher Revelation. It has a code of Scriptures, which it pretends to be divinely inspired; a body of traditions to confirm and develop them, and a ministry to interpret and explain. It has not only public worship, but insists especially on the merit of vocal prayer, as well as almsgiving; it abounds in external rites and ordinances, and prescribes fasts, feasts, ablutions, processions, and pilgrimages, and on one occasion even celebrates a sacrifice. These are all elements which much exalt the Mohammedan religion above Deism, with which, except in the denial of the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and in a general hatred to Christianity, it has little in common. Much closer is the resemblance between Islam and Unitarianism; so much so, in fact, that a Turk, on hearing a Polish Socinian state his creed, expressed his surprise that he did not put on the turban, and become one of the Believers.

* * * * *

It is a dangerous error to confound the Theist of antiquity with the Deist of modern times. The former admitted, more or less explicitly, a primitive revelation; the latter denies the necessity, and even possibility of any external manifestation of God's will. One strove amid

* M. de Florencourt, in his interesting pamphlet, detailing the reasons of his conversion. (In German.)

the darkness of superstition to descry the first dawning of true religion ; the other wilfully closes his eyes against the noon-day effulgence of Divine truth. One held the imperious necessity of public prayer, public worship, and sacrifice, even to a culpable compliance with the rites of Polytheism ; the other abhors all outward expressions of religious principle and feeling, and makes all religion to consist in what he calls the adoration of the heart. Deism, in its worship, is essentially personal, individual, and isolated. Theism, as it recognizes a two-fold action of the Deity, internal and outward, prescribes both public and private, individual and social worship.

Bossuet profoundly observes "that Deism is nothing else but a disguised or practical Atheism." When religion is not outwardly professed, it will soon be obliterated from the heart. Hence the common people, seeing the Deist abstain from public worship, violate the Sabbath, and never practise vocal prayer, call him an Atheist. Here we see how the simplest perceptions of common sense coincide with the deepest intuitions of genius. * * *

Deists ridicule the use of images, and in general all emblems employed in the service of religion. Yet they themselves confess that external objects may often become incentives to devotion, and the channels of religious feeling. The spectacle of creation's countless wonders—the exhaustless variety and exquisite organization exhibited in the animal and vegetable kingdoms—the glorious sunset—the starry magnificence of the heavens—the headlong cataract—the cloud-capt mountain—and the boundless expanse of ocean fill the soul with a sense of the goodness, the wisdom, and the majesty of the Almighty Creator. These religious impressions the Deist boasts he is peculiarly alive to;—these he professes to feel as vividly, and even more vividly than the Christian; yet in so doing he tacitly admits the principle of religious symbolism. But the Catholic Christian believing in the Incarnation, and in all the consequences of that great Mystery, must express his belief in a corresponding cycle of symbols. His creed being far more comprehensive and complete than that of the Deist, his ritual must needs be more expansive ; and the latter cannot consistently condemn him for symbolizing the objects of his faith.

On a former occasion we brought under the notice of the English reader the work of a profound and scientific

apologist of religion, one of the chief living ornaments of French literature.* Our business is now with the more unpretending production of a judicious and cultivated mind, which at an advanced period of life was reclaimed from Deism to the Church. This is the writer whom the Count de Montalembert succeeded at the French Academy, and on whom he pronounced the *éloge* in the magnificent speech he delivered on that occasion. M. Droz, chiefly indeed by his own fault, but partly by untoward circumstances, which he himself narrates, was drawn into the ranks of that infidel party which, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, exerted so fatal an attraction over the French youth.

The account which he gives of his early defection from the Church, is too instructive to be passed over.

"In my childhood," says he, "a peculiar disposition made me fear to come near a Church. Rarely did I enter one without my sight being disturbed by the extent of the edifice, and the height of the vaults; sometimes even I raised a cry, and was obliged to be carried out quickly. Thus the first impression I received in the holy places was one accompanied with a feeling of terror and aversion. At college religious practices fatigued me; some were even irksome to me; and this was another source of painful impressions.

"The routine of teaching in the college classes annoyed me the more, as I was disposed to relish the charms of study. I had literary ambition.

* * * * *

Having come to the year of philosophy, I was more than wearied. I was shocked to hear *discussions in a barbarous Latin, shackled too by the syllogistic form*, and whereof the method would have sufficed to perplex the simplest questions. I expressed to my father the profound disgust I felt; he filled me with joy in not opposing my desire of studying at liberty under his eyes. The very evening he gave me some works of philosophy, among others, *the Discourse on Method*.

"Freed from College restraint, I wished to be emancipated likewise from the excess of religious practices, and I did not forget that I had resolved to restrict their number; but how little time was needed to give them all up! Amid the scoffings constantly levelled at Christianity, I was without the means of defence. Almost always inattentive to religious instructions, I was far from having given to my faith the solid foundations required by the times we lived in. The philosophy of the eighteenth century was in the zenith of its power. Deists, in order to exercise influence, needed not any profound learning, nor cogent dialectics; irreligion

* See Dublin Review, March, 1852, Art. 1, *Etudes Philosophiques sur le Christianisme*. Par M. Nicholas.

was the fashion ; and indifferentism and unbelief seemed to fill the very air we breathed. While I was engaged in literature, and as I prudently descended from poetry to prose, I heard so many voices repeat in a tone of confidence, 'the cause of Christianity has been judged, and is for ever lost,' that I thought we should assume this opinion as an undoubted fact, when we had occasion to converse about religion with the enlightened men of the age. So were the sentiments of young men then formed. God might have punished me still more severely than He has done. He might have let me fall into that abyss of degradation, where sophists, basely proud, deny His very existence, proclaim that man is the slave of fatalism, and that morality is a fable devised by the cunning to dupe fools and imbeciles. No ! this excess of ignominy was spared me. God, whose goodness is greater than our sins—God, to whom I owe such a debt of gratitude—God has never entirely abandoned me.

"Proud of feeling within me quite a new enthusiasm for the lofty ideas of God, an immortality happy or miserable, and the sanctity of the moral laws, I thought I had grasped full possession of the truth. Yet a profound disquiet agitated me. What grief would my father feel in finding that his belief was no longer that of his son ! And how could I hope long to conceal my thoughts from him ? When he discovered my errors he addressed me in words as affecting as they were wise ; he redoubled his love for me, as we experience a livelier interest for a cherished being, when we dread his being afflicted with a serious malady. Had this gentle influence, which heaven sent to mine aid, been better seconded, I know not what would have been the result. I had lost my mother when very young. *Persons with pure intentions, but carried away by an intemperate zeal,* addressed me in a tone of rebuke far from moderate. I was then of an impetuous temper; I loved to wrestle with difficulties, and if I could not have the pleasure of overcoming them, I indulged myself with the gratification of defying them. I clung to my opinions the more, when I saw that, in order to defend them, I must needs incur some danger ; and so my errors took deeper root in my soul."—*Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien.*—pp. 10—16.

An instructive warning is surely conveyed in the above-cited passage. The gradual growth of infidelity in a youthful mind, and the causes which accelerated it, are matters of painful interest. Most of the blame is doubtless chargeable on M. Droz himself ; but his instructors and relatives incurred a fearful responsibility. We beg to call the attention of our readers to the passages in *italics*.

First, To teach philosophy exclusively at least in even an elegant Latinity, in an age and in a country, too, where for a century and a half the vernacular tongue had been

highly polished, and applied to all purposes of scientific discussion, would surely have not been judicious. But how preposterous was it to inculcate philosophy in a barbarous Latin, and in the dry, syllogistic form, too, at the very moment when an irreligious sophistry was arrayed in all the graces of the national idiom, and in all the charms which wit, fancy, and sensibility could impart! In a dead language, talent will never find the spontaneous expression of its ideas and feelings, nor, in consequence, excite a correspondent sympathy. In the Middle Age the case was far different. Then, except towards the close of that period, the vernacular languages were unformed. Secondly, learning was confined almost exclusively to the clergy, with whom, from long habit and tradition, Latin had become a second mother-tongue. And thirdly, philosophy addressed herself not so much to the public as to the school, and consequently dispensing with rhetorical aids and embellishments, aimed exclusively at scientific clearness and precision. But this was only a temporary, because a one-sided culture of the human mind.

The syllogistic method also, employed with great moderation, is of use to sharpen the intellects of youths, in the same way as skating strengthens their ankles. But, as skates, after a certain time, stiffen the ankles, so syllogisms, used to excess, or, except for the purpose of mental exercise, cramp the intellect. "Philosophy," says Frederick Schlegel, "while adhering to eternal truths, is still the Proteus that must take the forms of every age." A method of philosophic teaching serviceable in the Middle Ages, may become useless, and even hurtful in the present times; for there is a close, yet subtle connection between thought and the instruments of thought, such as language and method.

Secondly, M. Droz allows that he himself was to be blamed, inasmuch as he was inattentive to the religious instructions given in his College. Yet, from his whole history, it is evident that he had not been sufficiently guarded against the errors of the day, and not adequately grounded in the evidences of Christianity. Too much stress cannot be laid on the importance of ever adapting education to the wants of the time; for on such adaptation may not unfrequently depend the eternal salvation of souls.*

* In illustration of the statement in the text, we shall take the

Thirdly, The father of M. Droz seems, on the unhappy occasion of his son's falling into infidelity, to have acted with singular mildness and prudence. And probably he would have won back his son to religion, had the course he pursued not been thwarted by the intemperate zeal of other members of the family. Let us learn from this example the dreadful consequences of false zeal. Let us never, whether in conversation or in print, use harsh or irritating language towards Protestants or unbelievers. While we fearlessly proclaim the truth, let us never forget the most persuasive of all arguments, charity.

Such cases as those of M. Droz will, for some time to come, not unfrequently arise amongst us. Happily our youth will not be exposed to the same dangers as that of

liberty of alleging the following facts. In France, under the Restoration, a fearful number of young men who had been even brought up in Catholic Colleges, when introduced into the world, annually fell away from the faith. This sad apostacy was attributable, partly to the want of a Catholic University, partly to defects in academic education, which inattentive to the exigencies of the time, followed the routine of preceding ages. In 1828 the Abbé de Salinis, who has recently been raised to the See of Amiens, and is one of the most enlightened, as well as virtuous prelates in the Church of France, was, with two other friends, called to direct the College of Juilly, an establishment celebrated under the old French monarchy, and which, at successive periods, had bred two great philosophers like Mallébranche and De Bonald. Mgr. de Salinis immediately determined, in order to supply in some degree the want of a Catholic University, to add to the year of philosophy a year *de haute littérature*; and moreover, during the three years of rhetoric, philosophy, and this higher literature, to exact from the students essays on matters connected with the evidences of religion, whether against heretics or infidels. It is superfluous to add, that in other respects every attention was paid to the moral and intellectual training of the pupils. What was the consequence of this improvement on the usual method of education? Why, the excellent prelate we have named, assured the writer of these pages in 1836, that during the eight disastrous years which had elapsed from 1828 down to that time, and in a country, too, like France, where every art and blandishment were resorted to to taint the faith and morals of youth; and though the College of Juilly admitted youths of different ages, and always numbered from three hundred and fifty to four hundred students; *three only had abandoned their faith*, and two of those were coming back.

France in the eighteenth century; for, as we before observed, the strength of infidelity is spent, and the force of talent and learning will be on the side of the Church. But when young men, either from bad education, or from the perusal of bad books, or the frequentation of bad society, fall into irreligion, we implore their parents, guardians, relatives, and friends, to redouble their affection towards them, to pray for them, to induce them to join in prayer, and in good works also,* and withal strive to bring them round to Christianity by placing in their hands appropriate works, as well as by the conversation of discreet and enlightened persons.

Of a thoughtful mind and benevolent disposition, M. Droz not only cultivated letters, but employed literature to advance what he conceived the moral and social amelioration of mankind. With this view he studied the different systems of ancient and modern philosophy, and applied to the science of political economy; but by degrees he arrived at the conviction of the utter impotence of all human philosophy to achieve a moral reformation among the people. The researches he was led to while writing his first important work, entitled, "Moral Philosophy, or the different systems touching the science of life," brought this truth home to his mind. Then ensued a dreadful internal struggle. His studies revealed to him the powerlessness of philosophy for moral and social ends; and inveterate prejudice told him the doctrines of religion were false. But long years and a painful experience it took to disabuse him of these prejudices, and to convince

* The celebrated Princess Gallitzin, the friend of Count Stolberg, and who was so instrumental in reviving Catholicism in Germany, was brought back to the Church by practising the precepts of Christianity before she believed in its doctrines. Bred up in the Catholic faith, she imbibed from her husband, a friend and disciple of Voltaire, irreligious opinions. Retiring, later, from the world for the sake of superintending the education of her children, she resolved, while concealing her deistical sentiments, to catechize them in the Catholic faith. In perusing the Holy Scriptures, she came to that passage in the Gospel of St. John, (c. vii. v. 17) "If any man will do the will of Him (God), he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."

She resolved to test the truth of our Redeemer's words, and forthwith began zealously to fulfil the precepts of the Gospel; and three weeks had not elapsed before she was blessed with the gift of faith.

him that religion was as true in her dogmas as she was pure in her morality, and beneficent in her social influence. The great revolution going on in his mind was evidenced in his most considerable work, "The history of the Constituent Assembly," (Paris, 1838,) deservedly praised by M. de Montalembert, and remarkable as well for the candid and favourable manner in which he speaks of religion and her ministers, as for the judicious moderation and sagacious reflections which often distinguish it.

It is remarked by a German Catholic writer, William von Schütz, that the French infidel is always a libertine. M. Droz was certainly an exception from this rule. Remarkable for benevolent and amiable qualities, as we have seen, he seems to have discharged with fidelity the various duties of private life, and to have been blessed, for a long course of years, with much domestic happiness. The Almighty at last took compassion on a noble spirit wandering in darkness, and bestowed on him the gift of faith. He was, we believe, received into the Church in the year 1841. Towards the close of the year 1843 he published the little treatise, entitled, *Pensées sur le Christianisme*, which called forth from the revered Archbishop of Paris, Monseigneur Affre, a letter conveying to the author the warmest commendations. This publication was followed a few years after by the *Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien*, destined to serve as a kind of Appendix to the former Treatise.

These two little books breathe a spirit of sweet benevolence, display much sound sense, as well as delicacy of perception, and even strike at times by depth of observation. The style is clear and easy. The *Pensées sur le Christianisme* embrace four distinct heads, the dogmas, the morality, the worship, and the social influence of Christianity. The *Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien* follow up the same train of thought, but, we think, with more profoundness of view.

We shall quote from either work indifferently, classing the extracts under the four divisions above stated.

In the following passage the insufficiency of the natural law is ably demonstrated.

"The Deists are agreed that Atheism is a monstrous error: but on how many points does ignorance divide them! According to some, God is the Creator of matter; according to others, He is merely the architect. Many excuse Him for the evils existing here

below on the ground that, having wrought upon a rebellious matter, He was unable to do better. Certain Deists believe not in the soul's immortality. Rousseau thinks the soul survives the body, for a sufficient length of time at least, to re-establish the moral order, disturbed as it is by the iniquity which persecutes virtue here below; but whether the soul be of its own nature immortal, he knows not. Kant, a few days before his death, questioned by a friend as to what he thought of the life to come, replied like a sceptic.*

"It must be allowed, however, that the Deists, more and more, acquire juster ideas respecting the attributes of God, His power, justice, wisdom, goodness, clemency. But this body of truths is not the work of philosophy; she is indebted for them to her contact with Christianity, which hath diffused over the earth so many ideas conformable with the greatness of God and the happiness of man, and the light whereof penetrates, by some rays of reflection, even into the writings of its most inconsistent detractors.

"The reasonings employed to demonstrate the sufficiency of natural religion, appeared to me feeble when I seriously examined them. That natural law, and conscience, too, destined by her mandates, her warnings, and her rebukes, to impose on us the observance of that law, are immense benefits of the Creator. A proof of the existence of God—a proof which would dispense me from demanding any other, is, that this world goes on in despite of the efforts men make to prevent its going. God, who willed the duration of his work, has implanted within us instincts of pity, and notions of right, which it is not in our power to forget, nor entirely to stifle. Christians and Deists think that the natural law is a Divine law. But, in the estimation of the Deist, it is the sole revelation; in that of the Christian, it is the first revelation.

"It is very strange that another should be needed,' exclaims Jean Jacques. That would be indeed strange if *the other* abolished the first, and substituted one contrary to it. But the first remains so immutable, that at the present day, if fanatics were to come in the name of heaven to command a crime, it would suffice, in order to confound them, to oppose to them the natural law, because it is impossible for God to contradict Himself.

"It were superfluous to prove how precious are the aids to which we at this moment refer. Every man in the enjoyment of his reason recognizes their universal importance. But let us not argue against Christianity as if it came to rob us of those aids; it upholds, it confirms the natural law; it renders it more complete, and more intelligible; it strengthens the conscience; it leaves us what we possessed, and adds new to old benefits.

"The only question to examine is, whether the supports which Christianity unites to the former ones, be necessary, and whether

* See Biographie Universelle, Art. Kant, by M. Stapfer.

they merit the gratitude of mankind. Sure as it is that natural law and conscience offer inestimable advantages, so certain is it that ignorance, prejudices, passions, vices, can obscure the natural law, and deceive the conscience. Will he, who from infancy has seen men reduced to slavery, and victims immolated upon the altar, be able to read in his own heart the law which prescribes the love of his fellow-creatures? Can the child in our neighbourhood, who in one of those agglomerations which deserve not the name of family, constantly witness the example of debauchery and theft; whom vagrancy takes from his den, and drives into other abysses where his education in crime will be perfected—can this unfortunate child find in the depths of his own conscience a light strong enough to dispel the darkness that has thickened around and within him? A less frightful, but still melancholy situation is that of men, whom their destitution, their own wants, and those of their families, doom to hard, incessant toil, and who lead a purely mechanical life: who, absorbed in the cares of the present, have no thought as to the future; and whose misery is frequently aggravated by vice. The voice of consolation must awaken within them good instincts. Their lot would be ameliorated if they knew other recreations than those of drunkenness; if they knew how to employ the day of rest; if they were early taught what strength is found in short, ejaculatory prayers, that may be joined with all labours and all sufferings.*

"Is the young man thrown into the world sheltered from the seductions that surround him, if he has for his sole protection but the counsels given to his inexperience by his own distracted conscience? Powerful aids would be necessary to engage him only to reflect.

"We are so weak, that numerous disorders subsist, even under the empire of the Gospel. Yet, to convince ourselves that its power is far superior to that of the natural law isolated, we need but cast a glance at the state of the world prior to Christianity. How many examples of servitude and licentiousness have ceased to afflict the eye! How many vices and crimes, the recollection whereof shocks us, then excited neither reprobation nor surprise! How many virtues have been purified, and been rendered more active! How many tears been dried up by the hand of charity!

* Extreme poverty is an abundant source of impiety. If we speak of God to men who want the necessaries of life, we shall often receive frightful answers, such as the following: "If there were a God, we should not see so much misery." God—I do like Him. He does not think of me. I do not think of Him.—Accordingly, when beneficent persons, by their purse, and by their counsel, aid these suffering creatures, and help to rescue them from their afflicting condition, the soul of those unfortunate beings opens to hope, and their eyes turn imploringly to heaven.

Let us not be so unjust as to deny that great ameliorations have been wrought in laws, in manners, and customs; and let us proclaim with gratitude that Christianity is the source of happy changes obtained upon earth.

“Astonished at its power, moved by its blessings, I asked myself whether we could not judge it solely by its fruits, and whether the services it has rendered to mankind be not convincing arguments of its truth. I said to myself also, self-love makes us often speak with levity on the gravest subjects; we decide that such supports suffice, and that others are superfluous. We think to be strong enough with the first; we should be mortified in accepting new ones. We dispute the infinite power of God; and we discuss what He will be allowed to offer us!”—*Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien*, pp. 43-53.

The following reflections on original sin, and its consequences, spiritual and temporal, are striking and new.

“Dogmas, which so many people in the present age would wish to be ignored, dogmas exert on morality a prodigious influence. Divine goodness hath not been content with merely uttering these words, *love God and men*. What courage for putting them in practice is not inspired by the self-immolation, the sufferings, and the triumph of Christ! Admirable harmony! The power of dogmas upholds man in the course tracked out by the wisdom of precepts.

“Yet this portion of Christianity is the object of bitter censures. Have not the charges of absurdity, nay even of immorality, been often lavished upon it? Infidels are indignant at the dogma of original sin; they ask how we can reconcile, with the goodness and justice of God, the belief that all generations, even the remotest, will have to undergo the penalty of a fault which they have not even seen committed, and which preceeded, by so many ages, their birth. A clear reply is found in the simple recital of facts. God made man exempt from sufferings; and gave him the power of insuring the happiness of his own fate. Man abused his free-will and sinned. Destroying the riches wherewith he had been loaded, he could transmit to his race but a heritage of misery. God, however, did not abandon the work of His thought; and we impeach His justice when we should adore His goodness. Man preserved his free-will; he was still allowed to wrestle with misfortune. If the example of the ferocious Cain became contagious, the gentle Abel had imitators also. If painful exertions were needed, in order to cull the fruits which, in the abode of primitive happiness, came spontaneously forth, those exertions were not without reward. Labour is not a mere source of fatigues; certain enjoyments accompany and follow it. Certain virtues, which would have remained inactive, were in man's new situation called forth. The children of Adam were, like him, made subject unto death; but

after the Fall, a term to earthly existence became desirable ; it is the last hope of persecuted weakness. Some pleasures are mixed up with our sadness ; and melancholy has charms of its own. These are, doubtless, very poor compensations for the bliss we have lost through the fault of our primeval parents. But others there are which be infinite. Celestial forgiveness hath come down upon earth ; mankind have received, in the atonement of Christ, the greatest proof of tenderness which the Eternal could give. A holy Pontiff, transported with gratitude in meditating on the wonders of Redemption, gave utterance, in a rapture of love, to that sublime expression : 'O felix culpa !' "—*Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien*, pp. 76-80.

The author then proceeds to show that the mysteriousness of Christian dogmas is a proof of their Divine origin. After observing how closely interlinked are the great mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption, he points out the immense void which Deism leaves unfilled in her religious system, and how the human soul naturally yearns for an Incarnate God.

" When, in my Deism, I sought to imbue myself with religious feelings, I often regretted that God should be so removed from our feeble contemplation ; and the sad reflection occurred to me, that for many Deists the Deity is perhaps but a pure abstraction. Assuredly Polytheism cannot be a subject of regret. Absurd and foolish belief ! The gods banished God from the universe, and seemed to enter into familiarity with men only to tranquillize them as to the vices whereof they afforded them an example. But Deism did not respond to all the wants of my soul ; it does not place us, in regard to the Almighty, in relations sufficiently accommodated to our weakness. True religion must combine all the advantages necessary to enlighten and to strengthen us. Deism does not combine them ; it is vague ; it fails in the precious means for ruling man, and leading him to happiness ; we feel Deism to be an incomplete religion. I saw a problem was to be solved ; I sought to account for it in my own mind ; and I did not see that what I sought for was near at hand. The doctrine of the Trinity teaches us that there is one only God, who is infinite ;—a pure spirit, and that there are in Him three Persons, perfectly equal in all things, having the same Divinity and the same nature.

" One of the Divine Persons has taken a body like unto ours ; but after having immolated Himself for us, He cast it off like a garment when he mounted up into heaven. Christians may therefore contemplate God made man, assist at His death, at His resurrec-

* This expression of St. Augustine has been adopted by the Church in her hymns.

tion, worship Him even in heaven, without becoming anthropomorphists. The Christian creed responded in a manner so direct and so just, to the wants which the insufficiency of Deism left in my mind, that I experienced a deep emotion in seeing the truth thus flash forth from a mystery, from an incomprehensible fact. * The more the Divine light penetrates into our soul, the more we discover that the whole body of mysteries presents the true history of the relations of heaven with earth, and of earth with heaven."—*Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien*, pp. 82-4.

In the second division of his subject, M. Droz compares the relative bearings of philosophy and Catholicism on morals. He shows how weak are the restraints which Deism imposes on the conscience; how vague and indefinite is its ethical teaching; and how utterly incapable it is of even enforcing the observance of those precepts, which it borrows from the Gospel.

The following passage is one of the most thoughtful in the present volumes.

"Very few men are capable of resisting every species of seduction. There are many more than we perhaps suppose, who would not violate their duty for a considerable sum; but among those untempted by so gross a lure, we see some keenly alive to honours, to titles, or to ribbons. Of those two kinds of weakness one is viler, the other more absurd. The man who treats both with like disdain, will let himself be seduced by the smile or the glance of a woman; and he who passes with honour out of all these ordeals, will perhaps, in order not to disoblige a friend, commit some crying injustice.

"Philosophy does not sufficiently impose on us the duty of self-watchfulness; it condemns guilty actions; but it is indulgent towards thoughts and desires not having immediately fatal consequences. Religion, more long-sighted, interdicts those desires, because they lead to actions; and those thoughts, because they engender desires. Men fear to burthen themselves with too many anxieties; they fear to sadden life by regulating it. But self-vigilance powerfully contributes towards the happiness of him who exercises it; he enjoys the harmony which reigns between his thoughts, his desires, and his actions; he alone is truly man.

"The more we observe, the more we perceive that it sufficeth not to teach a pure morality; but that man must receive the force to practise it. What follows from the adoption of a wise theory, without a correspondence to it in our lives? A flagrant contradiction—a perpetual accusation—an inevitable condemnation. Out of the number of our moral systems, choose the one which you will judge the best; examine its effects without partiality; it has very little influence; it exercises the intellect far more than it subdues and

changes the soul. If some philosophers appear to draw great advantages from the theory they love, it is those who, endowed with a rare firmness of character, impart to their theory the individual strength existing in themselves. Religion supports her disciples; our systems have need that we should support them; we are too weak to obtain in this way great results.

"One observation deeply struck me. Let a Deist borrow all the Gospel morality to make it the rule of his conduct; he will have under his eyes the same counsels, and the same precepts which Christians there read; and yet its effects will be very different. It is materially the same moral code; it is again the wisest theory; but detached from dogmas, and from worship, it has scarcely more influence over souls than the teachings of philosophers. Isolated, it is bereft of life; the Divine breath ceases to animate it.

"There is, therefore, an immense advantage on the side of believers. When we clearly see that, without the aid of religion, morality cannot penetrate into large masses of men; that, without the same support, our opinions want fixedness, wise one day, foolish the next; that we find it but too easy to change the rules of life we trace out for ourselves, to modify them as our spirits rise or sink; then, so far from denying the blessings of revealed religion, we may almost venture to say God owed it to His feeble creatures."

—*Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien*, pp. 59-64.

Under the head of worship, the author draws a beautiful contrast between the prayer of the Deist and of the Christian; the one fitful and irregular, the other recurring at stated times; the one purely isolated and personal; the other public and congregational, as well as private; one the creature of mere individual impulse; the other the result of public ordinance, as well as the effusion of personal feeling.

"My thoughts frequently recurred to the immense advantage which religion possesses of imparting with her precepts the force of putting them in practice. Certainly religion has powerful guarantees for obedience to her laws in the Divine seal stamped upon them—in the eternal rewards and punishments that will be dispensed by the all-infallible judge; and yet what means does she not employ to recall our fickle and distracted minds to a sense of duty! I gave, for the first time, serious attention to the practices of the Catholic religion. They had often been before the object of my disdain, one only excepted—prayer. That man cannot be really considered a Deist who professes to believe in God, but who, in his days of prosperity, never addresses to that Divine Being an homage of gratitude and love; and who, when beaten by the tempests of adversity, implores not His supreme goodness. Sophists declare that it is absurd to pray, or to suppose that, at the voice of weak

creatures, God will suspend the laws of the universe. What seemed to me absurd, even before I became a Christian, was to believe that God never listens to prayer; for He would then fail either in power or in goodness. If the deplorable opinions of these sophists were true, then would ensue horrible consequences. We should have a God who would not be a God; heaven would contain but a dumb, motionless idol; fatality would reign upon the earth; hope even would abandon man.

“ The Deist may pray, and pray with fervour; but often he neglects that act so necessary to the support of moral life; he is sole judge of the moments to be devoted to it, and few external aids bring them to his recollection. When a Deist I prayed, but without regularity, in despite of all my resolutions, and though my heart was easily open to religious impressions. The thought of the benefits of the Creator enhanced in my eyes the beauty of a fine prospect; and civil discords terrify me above all, when I contemplate the magnificence of the abode, which God hath given us to dwell in peace. The prisoner, in order to preserve his physical strength, must at intervals breathe a purer air; the soul in the same way, if it wish to revive its moral strength, must not remain perpetually on this earth agitated by passions, but must rise in thought towards the dwelling of peace. A Christian is happy that his religion obliges him to regularity in prayer. Always, at waking, his eyes turn towards the common Father of men; and always, at the close of day, his thoughts are fixed upon the faults he has committed. Is anything more conformable with reason, than such wise practices?

“ I long regarded our Churches as the workshops of superstition. I at times entered them, led sometimes by a vain curiosity, sometimes by the desire of dispassionate observation. One day I observed persons divided by political opinions, and kneeling by the same altar. Their countenances were calm; they read attentively; and the books they had in their hands obliged them to pray for each other. This idea suggested the most pleasing reflections. When I cast my eyes on the silent, devout multitude, I was touched. I remembered the words of our Saviour: ‘ When two or three shall be gathered together in my name, I shall be in the midst of ye; ’ and for some moments I felt the influence of those words. It is impossible for any serious observer not to be struck by the imposing unanimity and elevation of the thoughts and vows of so many men gathered together, repenting of their faults, demanding succour of God, and supplicating for the peace and happiness of the world.

“ There are celestial aids, which my ignorance had a difficulty in comprehending. In order to discover the secret of the faithful, I sought to place myself in their position. I then perceived what copious springs of strength, of confidence, and peace, are opened by the sacraments to Christians. It was not granted to me to catch

more than a glimpse of these marvels ; for all the noble enjoyments of the soul are shrouded by a mysterious veil ; and we can form a just idea of them only after having felt them ourselves. Hence arises an obstacle which meets and afflicts the Christian, when he strives to make the infidel conceive the delights wherewith he is himself inebriated. This obstacle, I repeat, is the result of a general law. Eloquent writers, poets inspired by genius, would ye be understood by the vulgar, if they heard you descant on the charms of study, and of glory?"—*Aveux d'un Philosophe Chrétien*, pp. 68-74.

The solemnity of Catholic worship touches even the Protestant and the Infidel. Deeply symbolical as are the majestic rites and ceremonies of the Church, and therefore clearly intelligible to those only initiated in her doctrines ; still many a stranger, impressed with their beauty and grandeur, has been led by them to examine more closely into the evidences of a religion, which appeals so powerfully to the senses, the imagination, and the feelings of the heart.

"Every man," says our author, "persuaded of the existence of a God, watching over the beings, the creatures of his hands, feels that he owes Him a tribute of worship, gratitude, and love. In the times when Deism is preferred to Christianity, it is a very general opinion that exterior worship is fit solely for the ignorant multitude, and that interior adoration suffices for enlightened men. Doubtless a pure aspiration of the soul towards God is more efficacious than the mechanical recital of long prayers, and than the assistance of the body at multiplied ceremonies. The books of philosophers are not necessary to instruct us in this truth. The great reproach of Christ to the Pharisees was, that they servilely adhered to the letter of the law, and were proud of their punctual observance of its precepts ; while the sentiments it ought to have inspired remained foreign to their obdurate hearts. Jesus preferred to them people of a dissolute life, but yet capable of repentance and love. * * * * *

"To be a Christian we must believe dogmas, practise morality, and attend at worship. Of these three conditions I grant that the last is the easiest to be fulfilled ; and I admit that the one which bids us conform our lives to the Divine standard of morals, is the most difficult. To accomplish this part of the law we must stifle our passions, and root out our vices ; pride must succumb, frivolity disappear, and charity reign, where selfishness ruled. But the question is not which is the most difficult part of the law to follow ; but how we shall endeavour to neglect none ? What will aggravate the guilt of the Christian if he violate the moral law, is all the aids wherewith celestial goodness has been pleased to surround

him, in revealing to him doctrines, and in giving him a worship. O madness! what God judges necessary for the wisest men, pretended philosophers declare superfluous for them.

“True as it is that piety resides in the heart of man, so certain is it that the pious man, in order to fix his attention, and to stir up his soul, is powerfully aided by ceremonies, by those visible signs which strike even infidels, and which produced on the Atheist, Diderot, so vivid an impression. ‘I have never seen,’ says he, ‘that long file of priests in sacerdotal habits, those young acolytes clad in their white albs, girt round with broad blue sashes, and scattering flowers before the Blessed Sacrament;—the multitude following them in a religious silence;—so many men with their heads bowed down to the earth; I have never heard that grave and pathetic chant uttered by priests, and affectionately responded to by the countless voices of men, women, and children, without my entrails being moved, and the tears coming into my eyes.’

“Diderot was easily excited; he lived in his imagination; but long before him a masterly observer, Montaigne, had said: ‘There is no soul so crabbed but feels itself touched with reverence, when it contemplates the sombre vastness of our Churches, the diversity of our ornaments, and the order of our ceremonies; and when it listens to the devotional sound of our organs, and the grave, religious harmony of our voices. Those, even, who enter the Church in a spirit of contempt, yet feel a certain inward shudder and a degree of awe, which makes them entertain a distrust for their opinions.’*

“All his knowledge will not transform man into a pure spirit; but his soul, encompassed by the senses, needs exterior worship to feed interior devotion. To suppose the contrary is not to observe; it is to dream.”—*Pensées sur le Christianisme*, pp. 82-6.

What wisdom, what tenderness of feeling characterize the following passage, where the author speaks of the future happiness of the elect! What a fulness of consolation must not the Catholic religion have poured into the bosom of this aged father of a family, when she dispelled all the cruel doubts that had so long haunted him, threw a charm round the evening of his life, hallowed all his domestic affections, and held out to him the hope of

* We give the original. “Il n'est âme si revesche, qui ne se sente touchée de quelque reverence, à considerer cette vastité sombre de nos églises, la diversité d'ornemens, et ordre de nos ceremonys, et ouyr le son dévotieux de nos orgues et l'harmonie si posée et religieuse de nos voix. Ceux mesmes qui y entrent avec mespris sentent quelque frisson dans le cœur et quelque horreur qui les met en défiance de leur opinion.”—*Essais*, liv. 2, c. 12.

re-knitting in heaven the sacred ties of earth ! Religion, religion alone can sustain and gladden old age.

" Under the cruel losses so frequent here below, we would fain believe that one day we shall again see the beings whom we regret, and that the pure ties formed on earth will be reknit in heaven. But is not this an illusion ? Shall we indeed find again the objects of our love ? Is reason here in harmony with our desires ?

" When we endeavour to form an idea of the felicity of the just in the eternal abodes, let us combine all that the heart and the imagination can conceive as most enchanting ; and let us say with confidence, such are the delights that will inebriate pure souls, or the God of goodness reserves for them a bliss still more perfect.

" This reasoning, the justness whereof is evident, ought to satisfy us ; but it speaks more to the head than to the heart ; it does not solve the question, and lets an afflicting doubt subsist. This doubt increases, when we examine the possibility of prolonging in heaven the affections of earth. The first reflection tends to dispel our hopes. What pleasures can approximate to the happiness springing forth from the contemplation of the Deity ? That happiness will absorb all our faculties, all our power of knowledge and love. No philosopher, no logician, will admit the contrary. We must then forego all earthly illusions ! We must then regard the relations of son, husband, father, and friend, as essentially transitory, fugitive, and destined irrevocably to perish !.....My heart is troubled.

" Revive, O cherished hopes, revive at the voice of Christianity ! All that is purest in our feelings may be allied with all that is most exalted in our intelligence. My error originated in the fact that the soul, subjected to the senses, attaches the idea of truth to what is simple ; but in the life to come it will find nothing complex. Christianity itself furnishes a proof that the contemplation of the Deity destroys not the relations which I was on the point of giving up. Angels and saints enjoy that contemplation ; and yet they hear our vows ; they lay them at the feet of the Eternal. My mother prays for me in heaven ; and if the Divine Mercy will one day admit me there, I, too, will pray for my children. The angel guardian is not an exile ; he tastes celestial joys, and withal supports the sinner. The meditation on the eternal wonders will render our sweetest affections sweeter, will purify our purest feelings, and will not annihilate the relations which God himself hath saucified on earth."—*Pensées sur le Christianisme*, pp. 56-7.

The subject of the relations between faith and reason is one which sorely perplexes the honest adversaries of the Catholic Church, whether Protestants or unbelievers. In the passage with which we must conclude this paper, the matter is set forth with considerable clearness and force.

“One of the most important truths of religion is, that to be truly Christian, reasoning doth not suffice, but faith is necessary. At this word pretended philosophers think they triumph; they say that, after having sought to dissemble the need we have of stifling good sense, we end by being forced to acknowledge it.

“Thus speak men whose minds are superficial, or who, in despite of intellectual vigour, ill understand questions which their prejudices have previously decided. Faith does not shock reason; for the latter discerns and recognizes the advantages of faith, and bids us ask of the Almighty that gift of heavenly mercy.

“Often our reason speaks to us of its own weakness; it tells us that there are truths inscrutable to its gaze,—sentiments which it cannot inspire,—a force which it is incapable of imparting. In listening to it we feel the want of recurring to the Infinite Being, that He may vouchsafe to supply all our failings.

“Reason commands us to love God; but doth it suffice to reason in order to love? Will it be pretended that reason abdicates her rights when she tells us to pray, in order that God may imbue our hearts with all the love which His blessings should inspire?

“Reason decides that such a pleasure is illusive; this pleasure, however, leads us astray. Reason tells us to discharge such a duty towards the unfortunate; but the trouble we must undergo, and the dangers we must brave, arrest our charitable exertions. We see what is good, but we cannot perform it without a force, which God alone can bestow.

“As to the belief in Christian truths, something passes in oursouls analagous to what we have described in regard to the sentiment of charity, and the force requisite to discharge our duties. God allows us to exercise the reason wherewith He has endowed us; and that reason teaches us to admit the evidences of Christianity. But yet, if the belief, which is the result of thatenquiry, has no other foundation to rest on but a reason arrogant and weak withal; it will be very difficult for us to remain submissive to a principle proclaimed by it, to wit, that we should not dispute what we know to be revealed. Sometimes we may have doubts, not, I trust, on the general truth of religion, but on mysterious points, which, by an absurd curiosity, we would fain discuss. These doubts we may remove, but they will recur to trouble us. Our love for God, our fidelity in following His commandments, will suffer by the uncertainty of our belief. It is from such a condition so unworthy of the Christian, God emancipates the soul by faith.

“Let us beware of debasing religion to the level of a mere human science. Can we have already forgotten the happy use which God, in His goodness, vouchsafes to make of His power, in order to come to our aid? After having seen Him introduce on this earth His laws, and His worship, shall we presume to relegate Him to heaven, and to leave Him no longer any relations with ourselves? The Divine author of religion can alone impregnate our souls with His

doctrines. The effects of *faith*, and those of *mere adhesion of the mind*, are as different as the sources whence they spring. Faith infuses into the heart that repose, and that quietude, which man cannot give himself. Opinion, without any other support but reasoning, may be shaken by danger, and overturned by sophistry. Faith alone gives birth to apostles and martyrs.

“Now we see the place occupied by faith in the admirable scheme of Christianity, and comprehend the axiom, that to become a Christian, reasoning is not sufficient, but prayer is necessary also. The accents of humble, confiding prayer, draw grace down from heaven, and faith together with it.

“Let us never forget that God vouchsafes to act on man ; it is the greatest of His blessings, and that whereby we turn all the others to profit.

“Let us not fear boldly to proclaim all Christian truths, though it will unavoidably happen that certain spirits will find them puerile, because they are sublime. I say it with confidence, all reasonings in the world cannot supply faith ; and the latter may render our studies and researches superfluous, if it pleases the Almighty to communicate it by a stroke of grace. So was it received by that man destined to preach Christianity to the Gentiles ;—that Paul, who, in the energetic words of a poet, ‘falls down a persecutor to rise up an apostle.’”—*Pensées sur le Christianisme*, pp. 40-3.

We heartily recommend to the reader the perusal of these two little volumes. As evidences of the triumph of religion over a mind that had long resisted her call, they are highly interesting ; but they moreover abound in sagacious and original remarks, and are characterized by a subdued and tranquil tone of feeling, as well as by that wisdom, which is more rare than talent.

ART. III.—*Ceremonial according to the Roman Rite*. Translated from the Italian of JOSEPH BALDESCHI. With the Pontifical Offices of a Bishop in his own Diocese, &c., &c. By J. D. HILARIUS DALE. London, Dolman, 1853.

A CELEBRATED Oxford dignitary, unskilled in the ways of the world, having once been beguiled into a ball-room, and being asked on his return from the festive

scene what was his impression of a country-dance, replied, in true Johnsonian phraseology, "Sir, it appears to me a very tedious and operose method of traversing the length of a room." Not very different, as we conceive, is the view which the candid Protestant takes of the elaborate and complex ceremonial of the Catholic Church. Such portion, indeed, of that sacred rule of order as addresses itself to our natural love of the beautiful and the picturesque, he might possibly treat with greater consideration and respect. He would fancy that of this department of ceremonial religion at least, he could divine the objects, and those objects he would summarily conclude to be, the allurement of the curious, the gratification of the worldly, and the conquest of the weak. But of that which after all constitutes the essence, and as it were the kernel, of our great ceremonial system, the actions, the gestures, the tones of voice; the "genuflections, osculations, crucisignations," and whatever else belongs to the actual *work* of divine worship, apart from the shew, our supposed critic would consider that he was forming a remarkably mild and liberal judgment in pronouncing that, to say the least, it is a cumbrous and puerile machinery; a childish and dawdling method of doing business, in short, "much ado about nothing," as the "mazy round" of the dance might appear in the eyes of a spectator too deaf to hear the music, or too unpoetical to appreciate the spirit of the scene. It was with some such view as we are describing, that the compilers of the Common Prayer Book, anticipated, in their treatment of the ancient offices of the Church, the days in which time would be saved, distance abridged, and manual labour spared, by the application of steam. Their lament over the "multitude of responds, verses, vain (?) repetitions, commemorations and synodals" is even pathetic. Their patience, they tell us, was well nigh exhausted, their spirits quite broken down, by the "number and hardness of the rules called the Pie," and "many times they had more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when found," nor could they form any more exalted conception of "Anthems, Responds, Invitatories, and such like things," than as of so many impediments to the continuous reading of Scripture.* Under the influence of such objections,

* Preface to the Common Prayer Book.

divine worship becomes a procedure but little more solemn than a Meeting of the Privy Council, and far less formal than a dinner party at the Mansion House. The ceremonial of the Sanctuary is absolutely cast into the shade by a Chapter of the Order of the Garter. And last, not least, the contents of Missal, Breviary, Ritual, Pontifical, and Antiphonarium are packed into the compass of a volume, considerably less bulky than that into which the Rev. John Hilarius Dale has just collected the mere rubrics and ceremonial directions of the Holy Roman Church.

Three centuries and upwards have passed away since the objection with which we are here engaged, was first put into shape with such terrible results to the unity and peace of Christendom. The rule of simplicity in Divine worship was embodied in those few and scattered Forms of Prayer which a wild and unbridled fanaticism conceded to the prejudices of antiquarians, rather than to the principle of order; while in places where a free scope was allowed for the operation of the same rule, it was still more effectually carried out in the abolition of Forms altogether. And where, as in the Catholic Church, this principle has been firmly and steadily met by an antagonist theory, it yet gives life to that great mass of Protestant feeling, which finds its vent in popular criticism, whether through the medium of the press, or of ordinary conversation. Meanwhile, the Church, as little affected in her orderly course by these adverse manifestations as one of the heavenly luminaries by the moats which ever and anon obscure its lustre without impeding its majestic progress, has never abated one iota of her watchfulness over this particular department of her office. The Congregation of Sacred Rites has conducted its deliberations with the same calmness, and promulgated its decisions with no less effect, since Puritanism and Infidelity have sapped the faith of whole nations, than when Rome bore undisputed sway over the hearts and consciences of our forefathers. Not a sentence has been dropped, nor a rubric modified, in any one of the Church's sacred offices, to stem revolt, or conciliate disaffection; on the contrary, if any change of policy be perceptible, it is all in the direction of strictness, and not in that of relaxation.

To our own minds, there is no one of the (subordinate) notes of Holy Church which is more impressive than this, as we may venture to term it, almost pertinacious inflexi-

bility. She speaks as she is moved, not as men expect, and what she speaks she does not recall. "Ubi erat spiritus, illuc gradiebantur, nec revertebantur cum ambularent."^{*} The clouds gather around her, eclipse her lustre, and seem even to thwart her path, but they glide over her luminous disc, and again she reappears in all her glory. The lightnings glance fearfully on every side of her, and threaten her very existence, the while she seems unconscious as a child that their beginnings are in wrath and their end in desolation. The storm beats heavily and the ship rocks, but He is asleep on a pillow. Threaten who will, and come what may, the Church is neither troubled nor resentful. All the world, for instance, has been clamouring that the love of Mary is exalted by the Church to the disparagement of her Divine Son and adorable Creator. The Church, far from answering, does not even seem to hear the charge. But awhile after, forth comes a decree in Mary's favour; a fresh devotion indulged, or a fresh sanctuary commended, or a fresh miracle accredited, or a local festival generalized. The savageness of the world is redoubled. Her mandate is for once disobeyed; nay, worse, it is *ignored*. She lashes herself, for want of a worthier victim, into fury, and desists from her fury only through pure exhaustion. There is a lull and a pause. There is silence in hell. Then, when least expected, the voice of the oracle is heard again. It is not that with human policy the Church has suspended her decision till the clamour is gone by, and the "pressure" taken off. It is simply that she speaks, now as before, when she is "moved," and that her Divine Guide so orders her announcements as that they shall not be borne upon the surges of the ocean or the gusts of the storm, but be heard as the still small voice in the midst of the calm. What is her new response? What reply does she accord, not to the insolent demands of the world, but to the loving interposition of the Angels? Mary has had her day, now is Jesus' time. It was thus that a few years back the charge of "Mariolatry" received a practical answer in the institution, all unlooked for, and due, it would seem, to the personal devotion of the present Pope, of a second festival in honour of the

* Ezech. i. 12.

Most Precious Blood. It seemed like the restoration of an equilibrium. For Mary's Dolours had their autumnal commemoration, why not the Sacred Blood-shedding itself? As the mournful passion-flower blooms intermediately between the bright marygold and the pale rose of Christmas, so did the Feast of our Lady's Compassion, in September, take its place between that of her Assumption and those commemorative of her purity. But why no duplicate celebration of the Passion also? The question was natural, and the solution came in the form to which we have just alluded. And such providences, as we may call them, have an importance beyond their direct issue. They cast light upon the honours of which our Lady herself is the immediate object, and prove how the Church does "All for Jesus," even where His Mother or His Saints appear in human estimation the nearer to her heart.*

We never enter a church while Mass or other sacred office is in progress, without being struck by the same evidence of indomitable and unchangeable truth in the comportment of Holy Church. It is all very well to talk about the "gorgeousness" of our ceremonies and the attractiveness of our celebrations. After all, every Catholic knows that vestments, music, lights, and whatever else is supposed by the world to constitute the essence of our religion, are really but the very separable accidents even of our external worship. Protestants, especially those who have not travelled on the Continent, seem to fancy that the function of priests consists in singing High Mass. High Mass, with "Mozart's No. 12," seems to make up their idea of the Catholic worship. Of Low Masses many and daily, of communions numerous and repeated, they dream not in their philosophy. No wonder, then, that they should look upon our religion as weak and vulnerable. Once wean mankind from the love of finery, once get them (no very great achievement,) to prefer the music of the Italian opera to that of the best Catholic choir in London, and to admit that even the grandest Benediction falls short of an illumination at one of the club houses on the queen's birthday, (and who denies the superiority of gas to wax

* We may take this opportunity of uniting our testimony with that which the Catholic public has already borne, even by acclamation, to the merits of Father Faber's beautiful Treatise.

candles for such a purpose?) and these critics seem to think that the Church will sink into obscurity and insignificance! And assuredly, were "Functions" her life, and the attraction of the sight-lovers her aim, their calculation would be well-founded. But, unfortunately for this argument, the objector has not yet gone so far as to penetrate even the surface of the Ceremonial question, to say nothing of the others which remain behind. He must frame a theory which is applicable to the case of a Low Mass. He must next account for the fact, that the Church contrives in many a House of Novices, in many a foreign settlement, and in many a country mission in Great Britain, to live through months and years of Low Masses, without gold and silver, music, illuminations, and Protestant spectators. Thus our inquirer will come at length to know that the Church has ceremonies which are not showy, which involve no expensive, no decorative accompaniments; which may, nay, which must, proceed without curtailment or mutilation, whether Mass be said in the presence of the school-boy who serves it, and the three devout apple-women who assist at it, or in St. Peter's, before the Pope and his Cardinals, including the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation.

The fact is, that to talk of *ceremonies* as a kind of bait for sight-seers, is, in the ears of a Catholic, a simple absurdity. Anything less worldly and popular than a Low Mass it would be hard to imagine. Whatever attractiveness it has proceeds from the importance of the action, and appeals, therefore, to none but a simply religious mind. But of a Low Mass, devoutly celebrated, it would be truer to say that it outrages all Protestant notions of solemnity than that it simply does not meet them. The Mass, in its least ornate form, is, as we well know, the greatest action in the world, surpassing in dignity and importance the conception, not of men only, but of angels. It is the only appropriate worship that man can offer to God; and exalted as is the object of the homage, the homage itself (and more cannot be said) is worthy of its object. This action, so sublime in itself as to be worthy, (nay altogether worthy) of God, is couched under a form, and embodied in words, adequate to itself, as itself is adequate to God. The greatest gifts of the Almighty are subservient to it. Gold and silver, marbles and precious stones, the yield of the quarry, the mine, and the deep ocean, every creature

of God in its purest integrity and most perfect form, every work of man's device in its rarest and most finished excellence; these are its honoured vehicles, or its humble accessories. But these are the least glorious of its tributary accompaniments. It has absorbed into itself not merely the mightiest contributions of the mightiest intellects, but the very words of the Holy Spirit are incorporated into its substance, beautiful as the threads of the embroidered woof, or the tesselations of the variegated mosaic. Yet to a Protestant eye what is the exterior of this wonderful rite? A priest (it may be) of no commanding presence and no distinctive grace, preceded by a boy like other boys, issues from the sacristy, and makes his way to the altar. No ushers announce his approach, no sounds of music accompany his steps. With shuffling gait and downcast eye he advances to the place of his destination. His dress is neither gorgeous nor picturesque. It displays no graceful folds, it admits of no affective attitudes. Two candles far apart, not for use, yet not for show, and a large book, comprise the preparation for the solemnity. The sacred burden deposited, and the holy book opened, Mass begins. What, asks the Protestant, can be the secret of its power? What the charm which draws multitudes within its circle, awes all into respect, and wins most to devotion? Can this be "that accursed service," the theme of Jewel's railing accusations, the object of Edward's portentous proscriptions, the stimulant of chivalrous enthusiasms, the terror of intelligent nations, the forbidden topic of the loyal and respectable family? He is at a loss, and well he may be, to understand how an institution of so humble and unattractive an exterior, can yet have survived all the shocks of time, taken root in all the countries of the world, and be at this time the only visible link which connects the remotest ages of the world, the arch which bridges over the enormous chasm whereby we, with all our modern habits and ideas, are separated from the Christians of the Apostolic age. Nor will his wonder lessen as the Divine Mysteries proceed. Fortunate would the practised orator regard it if he could command, by his stirring appeals and his well-rounded sentences, but half the attention with which this congregation accompanies an act of devotion, in which, but for one or two short addresses that break its continuity, their presence might seem to be

almost overlooked ! It is essentially a transaction between the Priest and Almighty God. The words which compose it are perhaps unintelligible to the surrounding worshippers, at any rate they are uttered without reference to them. And by far the greater part of the Mass is said in secret. Its ceremonies, too, although numerous and complicated, have no artistic beauty, and many of them no visible significance. They are for the most part carried on out of sight of the people ; and although their general result be favourable to reverence, their particular scope is obviously not *effect*, but the completeness of the work upon which they bear. The holy Mass, divested of its merely ornamental accompaniments, is not a spectacle, but an action ; full of power and beauty to the Catholic, but to the Protestant, we should imagine, a most inexplicable fact, which can have little attraction but in its strangeness. There can be no question, then, that if mere popular favour be the object of the ecclesiastical ceremonies, their construction is, to say the least, singularly ill adapted to the end. We are speaking, let it be remembered, of ceremonies proper, not of their occasional accessories. We must look out for an explanation of their meaning and intention deeper and more philosophical than that which would invest them with a merely *theatrical* character. Such an explanation there must surely be, or holy Church could scarcely manifest so much care for this department of her ministry. Ceremonies are obviously of the *essence* of her constitution, for she deems it no condescension, but a simple duty, to summon authorities, and collect precedents, for determining such matters as the form of a vestment, or the place of a genuflexion.

Whatever be the secondary and indirect effect of Ceremonies in the way of popular edification, the end of their institution is the honour of Almighty God in the worship of His Church. The Church is the mirror of the starry firmament. If she be beautiful, as most beautiful she is, it is not that she studies to be so, but that she cannot avoid it. Her functionaries act according to fixed laws, execute their ministry, perform their courses, in certain prescribed circles. Love is the centripetal force which ever draws them nearer and nearer to the sun of their attraction ; awe the centrifugal, which forbids all rude and even familiar approaches ; and these two influences coincide in producing an equable and orderly march.

The ministers of the sanctuary perform their courses around the sun in orbits of greater or less proximity; priests the nearest, others in their several degrees. The inhabitants of this lower world look up, gaze on the blue and spangled field, and pronounce, poor worms of earth! that it is all for them. Yes, to give them, the creatures of a day, a light which they hardly value and not seldom abuse; to form a canopy for this little globe, a mere speck in the great universe; to lighten the sinner's path, or direct the progress of a ship in quest of gold, has there been all this expenditure of creation, and all this superfluity of arrangement! But it is not so. This world, viewed from the surface of one of those lustrous orbs, wears the appearance but of a star like itself. Though it were some day to be burned up with fire, and its place to be no more found, not the less would the sun of those distant worlds rise on them to-morrow, and they would continue to wait upon his pleasure with the same well-ordered and obsequious fidelity. In like manner, so long as our Blessed Lord descends to make Himself manifest on our altars, we will attend upon Him with the same honours, we will serve Him with the same love; as knowing that the very stones of the pavement would raise their voices to praise Him, rather than His presence should be unacknowledged and His glories unsung.

Thus it is that we may mistake a result for an end, and think ourselves the objects of what is beautiful and beneficent, when we are but contemplating the exterior manifestation of a system whose sphere is withdrawn from our view. “*Omnis gloria ejus filiae Regis ab intus; in fimbriis ejus circumamicta varietatibus.*”

Holy ceremonies are the necessary conditions, and appointed safeguards, of regularity and completeness in performing the work of God on earth. Where the Holy Spirit is, there is always order. Order and disorder are the very types, respectively, of heaven and hell. The natural world, which is God's creation and heaven's portraiture, is often likened to a temple. Its more exact counterpart is a sanctuary, or a religious house. “*Cœli enarrant gloriam Dei et opera Ejus annuntiant firmamentum. Dies diei eructat verbum, et nox nocti indicat scientiam. In sole posuit tabernaculum suum.*” Nature is every day keeping high festival. The flowers waft upwards their incense, the birds assist with their melody,

the glorious sun rises daily, best image of the world's true Light, upon a company equipped to receive him, and a choir in tune to greet him, sustains and animates them by his presence during the day, and sheds on them his benedictory beams at night. *The order of nature is so regular, her ceremonial so well defined, that each knows his place and his office, and all can calculate to a moment upon the incidents of the action.

Where is the Holy Spirit, there is order. It is the same with the temple which He appropriates in the mind and heart of the Christian. The waters of disorderly passion will rage and swell; the fire of wild concupiscence struggles for ascendancy; but the Spirit of God enters in, and the discordant elements are hushed into obedience and blended into harmony, and the mind becomes like a well-ordered polity, in which the weak are governed and the wise arbitrate, and the rebels are converted into workmen, and the aliens are expelled or held in check. Lastly, there is order in heaven. For each saint has his place, and each angel knows his office, and there are ranks of angels circling around the throne of the Lamb in their various degrees of proximity. And since there is order in heaven there is ceremony too. For "the angel took the censer and filled it with the fire of the altar, and cast it on the earth. And the smoke of the incense from the prayers of the saints ascended up before God from the hand of the angel."—Apoc. viii. 4—5.

The great centre of the ceremonial system by which its laws are regulated, and to which its provisions are directed, is the Most Holy Sacrament. Since our Blessed Lord condescends to hold a court on earth, it is meet that His Presence Chamber should be guarded against all unhallored intrusion. Those who come near Him, must be reminded of their privilege. There must be especial uniforms, observances, etiquettes, to distinguish the palace of the Sovereign from the dwelling-places of His subjects. Whoso draws near Him must purchase this prerogative by an act of submission. He must curb some inclination, sacrifice some taste, and follow some precedent, however humbling and unfashionable. As time proceeds, he will learn that these wise prescriptions are the "cheap defence" of loyalty, the natural ways of love. Who has not known how hard it is to retain love when reverence is away? Ill betide the sacramental union which disdains the trammels

of mutual respect! Short-lived is the duration of domestic joy, where courtesies are dropped as formal, rudeness admitted under the pretext of freedom, and the fund of consolation which should distribute itself through years of mutual observance, exhausted in a month by improvident anticipation and wasteful expenditure. And if the Church would have her holy festivals like the anniversaries of a well-regulated family, rather than like the wakes and fairs of the populace, she must secure their orderly conduct by the regulations of an affectionate zeal.

It requires but a brief analysis of the ceremonies of an ordinary Mass to perceive the bearing of the whole upon the honour of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. The interval between the Offertory and the Communion is that in which their number thickens and their importance rises. A little book was published a few years back, for the express purpose of showing that even the minutest ceremonies of the Mass are indispensably and obviously necessary as tributes of affection to our Lord, no less than as securities for the reverent celebration of His mysteries.* We will give a few instances in which the affectionate beauty of the several practices must commend itself to any devout mind. 1. The preparation for Mass. This is binding on the priest under sin, in order that he may never approach the Adorable Mysteries with an unclean heart or an unready mind. Nor does his preparation end when Mass begins. The preliminaries of the holy rite are simply penitential and preparative. It opens with a psalm which might seem to have been composed purposely for the occasion, so expressive is it of the sentiments which are natural to a devout mind on entering within the Holy of holies. Then follows a mutual confession between priest and people, and what is still more remarkable, a mutual prayer of absolution. And not until the celebrant has prayed that by the merits of the saints, whose reliques are deposited within the altar he is approaching, "all his offences may be forgiven," is he permitted to inaugurate the Divine mysteries. 2. The preparation of the materials of the holy sacrifice. They are first provided with the greatest possible care, and every human precaution is taken to secure their integrity. They are formally offered to the Eternal Trinity once and again, and deposited on the sacred stone with the sign of redemption, in memory

* *Explanation of the Ceremonies of the Mass.* Burns and Lambert.

of the Passion, which they foreshadow. 3. The double ablution of the fingers; first, before Mass, in token that the hands which touch even the sacred vessels must be holy; 2ndly, after the oblation, because they are soon to come into contact with the Body of Our Lord. 4. The closing of the fingers after consecration, and the retention of the hands within the limits of the Corporal, lest a single atom under form of which the Divine Presence might be concealed, should fall from the hands upon an unconsecrated spot. 5. The demeanour of the celebrant towards the Presence of our Lord upon the altar, which, (and not, as before, the Crucifix,) is after consecration to be the visible object of his devotion. To It he bends the knee in adoration; on It he fixes the eye, during several prayers, with loving attention; delicately must he touch the sacred Victim, reverently deposit It, and when he has received It, meditate intently upon the ineffable Gift. From the consecration to the communion the Priest is in the position of one having charge and custody of the Lord of life. His Creator entrusts Himself to the keeping of His own creature. Hence the especial Patron of celebrants, whose aid they are recommended to invoke before Mass, is St. Joseph, whom God made ruler over His house and guardian of His treasure. 6. The collection and disposal of the sacred particles. 7. The rubrical provisions against defects and accidents. All these directions are framed in the very comprehensiveness and providence of love. They are like the accumulated and reiterated precautions which result from a mother's forecasting of every possible disaster which can happen to the child of her yearning affection.

While the ceremonial arrangements of Holy Church admit of being regarded as the studious punctilio of devoted loyalty and delicate affection, there is likewise another point of view, in which they may be properly considered; and this is, as essential conditions of duly carrying out the work to which they relate. Their use in this respect we have already suggested; and here we will illustrate it in a few instances. All the ceremonies bearing on the Blessed Sacrament have, as it were, two sides (if indeed their intentions can be separated,) the one which may be called devotional, the other, official. Thus, for example, the ablution of the priest's hands has at once a natural and a symbolical purport; while it denotes the purity with which the mysteries should be approached, it likewise

secures the sacred substance, which the celebrant is about to handle, against the admixture of any profane element. The same may be said of several minute provisions in the Mass: such as, that the Priest shall never lay his hands outside the corporal after the consecration; that he shall avoid striking his breast at the Agnus Dei with the thumb and forefinger, &c. But in fact, every such rule of ceremonial necessity is likewise a dictate of affection, founded in that reverential love of our Lord, which guards Him with the tenderest care, not only against purposed insult, (which is here out of the question,) but even against accidental disrespect. Yet, more than half the world, and nearly all the English world, fondly imagines that priests at the altar move backwards and forwards, hold their hands in unnatural positions, vary the tones of their voice, and do many other strange things of the same description, upon no deeper principle and for no better reason than that they may carry out some piece of antiquated pageantry! One really would think that an age which prides itself upon its intelligence, would, for the sake of its character only, abstain from such ignorant and absurd imputations.

But holy ceremonial has other religious uses besides that of satisfying, as far as what is subject to human imperfection can satisfy, the claims of our Lord. One of the most important of these is its aptness to secure the habit of reverence in the ministers of religion. Nothing human can fortify us against the relaxing tendencies of custom and familiarity, except *rule*. All the good resolutions, and all the salutary exhortations in the world, will never keep a child of Adam from "falling by little and little" into disorderly ways without some artificial safeguard. Rules, binding in law or conscience, form the Church's prescription against this danger. The ceremonies of Mass bind the Priest celebrating under sin. Those which immediately bear upon the Sacrifice itself cannot be wilfully violated without mortal sin.

A further use of holy ceremonies is in acting as a safeguard to Sacraments. Our blessed Lord, as a trial of our obedience, has made His sacramental gifts to hang upon the minutest conditions. As when on earth He frequently imposed some apparently insignificant practice upon the applicant for His favour, as a test of earnestness and fidelity, or conveyed His healing power through some material medium, naturally inadequate to the effect; so in His

Church He has been pleased to make His Sacraments depend upon external actions, or to communicate their benefits through visible channels; as if to make proof of the humility and devotion of His children by the same means which provoke the scorn of the unbeliever. But because the tendency of human nature is to despise and undervalue such conditions as trivial, and to supersede our Saviour's law by some process more congenial to the wisdom of the world and the indolence of the human heart, the Church has imposed, under the severest penalties, moral as well as ecclesiastical, a literal compliance with these ceremonial provisions. Hence, the dependence of true consecration in the Sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist upon the presence of pure matter and the utterance of the prescribed words. Hence the solicitude of the Church to secure, above all things, the validity of the Orders whereby the power of consecration and pardon are conveyed. For all the reasons which dictate a jealous watchfulness in the administration of single sacraments, apply with inconceivably greater force to that in which are included the issues of many thousand masses and many myriads of absolutions.

We have not, however, exhausted the religious uses of Ceremonial until we have examined its bearing upon dogma. The trite, because most true, maxim of the heathen poet,

“Segnium irritant animos demissa per aures,
Quam quae sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus—”

is nowhere more pertinent than in this instance. Nothing, as is well known, has more powerfully contributed to sustain the great Catholic Tradition in the world than the Liturgies of the Church. They constitute a standing evidence from age to age of her doctrine and teaching; an evidence so much the more valuable as it is implicit and indirect. It is the evidence of a fact which can neither be gainsaid nor depreciated. It seems to have been the ancient Liturgies of the Church which, even beyond any other argument, worked upon the mind of the late Mr. Froude, who may be regarded as the author of the Catholic movement in the Anglican communion. If the great sacrificial rite of the Church, the very key-stone of the devotional fabric, is at the present time essentially one with those according to which the Adorable Victim was

offered on the altar in the first ages, what stronger proof can we desire of the claim which that Church has upon our obedience? Now, it requires but little further argument to prove that in this evidence the ceremonies of the Church bear a principal part; or rather, that without their exactitude and obligation this identity of rite, and as a consequence this unity of doctrine could never, as far as we can see, have been maintained. Indeed, the ceremonial system of the Church might summarily be described as the doctrine of the Real Presence in action. It bears to the mystery which it involves and expresses, just the same relation which the exterior deportment and features of a human being bear to his soul. The soul of the great Sacrament (which is in its turn the radiating point of every other sacrament) is written in the form of outward worship as in a countenance; speaks through* it as through the organs of a body. As you may read a man's character in his every motion, so, or rather much more entirely, may you trace the great dogma of the Divine Presence in the Holy Eucharist, through even the minutest features of the prescribed form. What a marvellous power must there not of necessity be in such a provision, to *work*, (as we may say) doctrine *into* the minds and hearts of the people! We grow as familiar with the mystery as with the character of a friend who is our daily associate; and from getting better and better acquainted with it, from breathing, living, energizing, in its every atmosphere, of course we grow enthusiastic and chivalrous about it, as about something without which life would not be desirable, and for which, therefore, life should be readily sacrificed. Strip mysteries of ceremonial, and what do they become? utterly powerless and continually evanescent. Ceremonial is the very language of mystery; and this is the main reason why the world hates one as much as the other. The devil is the cleverest of logicians. He is unmatched in the power of connecting cause and consequence. The study of his proceedings, if we can but keep ourselves outside them, is quite a lesson. He is far quicker in discerning where two and two make four, than many a good Christian. We take it, then, as an infallible attestation to the great importance of holy ceremonies in their bearing upon the Faith, that together with Miraculous Agency, the Religious Life, the Power of the Keys, the Supremacy of Peter, and whatever else is most directly bound up with

the essence of Catholicism, they share in their place and measure, the distinction of the Devil's and the World's most intense and most unrelenting antipathy.

The same conclusion as to the essential bearing of ceremonies on doctrine is suggested by the melancholy annals of the great Protestant Heresy. This awful manifestation of evil, in some of its forms, boldly cast off theology and ceremonies at one and the same time. When, as in the Church of England, its natural developments were thwarted by political and other causes, it attempted to construct a monstrous union between a mutilated theology and a barren ceremonial. Hence the ridiculous exhibition of the established religion which, in Archbishop Laud's time, provoked the just indignation of the Puritans. Stress was laid upon the use of vestments which symbolized nothing but an absent sacrifice, of bowings to an altar which served but as the memento of a departed Saviour. In our own days the same inconsistency has been revived in a still more grotesque shape. We hear of incense smuggled into churches under the form of pastilles; and of genuflexions to the elements of bread and wine which the Church of England emphatically declares to remain in their natural substances. These, however, are the few and rare exceptions;—the service of husks and nut-shells, by which it is vainly attempted to stay the appetite for food more substantial. Throughout the great body of the Established Church, doctrine and ceremonial have declined together. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the case of the sacraments. The ceremonies necessary to their essence have been habitually slurred over, or contemptuously depreciated. "We have the essentials," they cried, "the rest is superstition." "We never baptize without water, which by Christ's institution is alone necessary." Well, but if our Lord prescribed the substance, He left it to His Church to appoint the mode. How, indeed, can His simple rule (even taking it literally,) be observed without some supplementary provisions? How can one be baptized with certain matter and in a certain form, unless we secure, 1. The integrity of the matter; 2. The integrity of the form; 3. The contact of the matter with the person; 4. The essential unity of the action in the combination of matter and form together? Here are four indispensable requisites, each involving a host of tributary precautions. If, for example, there can be degrees of purity in the nature

of the matter, what is the precise point at which its integrity is fatally impaired? When is "matter" certainly valid, when certainly invalid, when dubious? Here is an opening for pages of moral theology. The same questions are incident to the case of the "form" also. Are not our Lord's words to be scrupulously followed, at least as to their literal *meaning*? If so, may any, and if any, what, deviation from them be admitted without injury to the sense? Suppose that the person baptizing, for any imaginable cause, were to substitute the word "bathe" for "baptize," or to express the three Divine Persons under the theological formula "Trinity," or, again, relying upon the intention merely, were to omit, as unnecessary, the form "Ego te baptizo," and simply adverting to the act, were to proceed "In Nomine," &c. Or, (to take a real case,) what if the "baptizans," in a fit of devotion, were to interpose a prayer for regenerating grace between the application of the matter and the utterance of the form, or *vice versa*? Surely, there must be a recognized theology to solve all these questions, and an authoritative and minute rubric to anticipate them.

Now see, we repeat it, the consequence of dealing with such matters as insignificant minutiae, tending to bind our Blessed Lord's promise, to fetter His grace, to promote superstition, &c., &c. Years ago we on our side said to the members of the Establishment, (the validity of whose baptism, say what they may, we have a most real interest in desiring,) "Look to your ceremonies; more is involved in them than perhaps you suppose." We were answered in language like the above, or were told that our own ceremonies, at all events, were not necessary to the essence of the rite. And when Protestants came over to us in numbers, and we gave them, as a precaution, conditional baptism, we were charged with ignorance of our own theology, (so peremptory against the *reiteration* of baptism,) or with holding it out as a temptation to Protestants, that if they would come over to us they would receive all the benefits of a *first* baptism! * Time went on, and then

* The latter charge has been publicly made by Mr. Keble; the former we know to have been made by Mr. Palmer. The course which the last named gentleman has latterly taken, in inviting apostate priests into his parish to preach against "Popery," is a striking and melancholy instance of "development" in the *wrong* direction.

came the Gorham Judgment, the measure, as it were, and the test, of the real question at issue.

The same is true of the other institution, which the Church of England has nominally retained, the "Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." In these latter days, a number of earnest men, irresistibly drawn towards Catholic truth, have endeavoured to delude themselves into the belief that, after all, they could enjoy the benefit of our religion without the necessity of becoming converts to it. But it was impossible in course of time not to see, that whether the doctrine of the Real Presence be (as Catholics say) confined to the Catholic Church, or otherwise, at all events, if held accidentally in the Church of England, it is held as a theory, and not as a matter of practical belief. If true, surely, they would argue, it is so gracious, so absorbing a privilege, so august in its nature, so comprehensive in its bearings, that to *ignore* it is not less impious, (perhaps even more so,) than to deny it. They could not but see that, being true, it must enter into the whole substance and complexion of the rite which, on the supposition, was instituted to embody, express, and convey it. More conclusive even than the renunciation of this doctrine in the formularies, was the fact, (too palpable to be glossed over or explained away like the words of ambiguous documents,) that the great dogma had absolutely ebbed away and disappeared from the *rubrics* of the Communion Service. Priests, so called, were seen habitually to treat the elements after a supposed consecration, with indifference, if not with disrespect; to receive them as mere natural food; to leave to their fate, to the receptacles of filth, or to the rapaciousness of clerks and churchwardens, the remnants of what was poetically dreamed to be the Body and Blood of our Lord; to approach the holy Table without preparation, and quit it without thanksgiving; to betray no emotion beyond such as would be excited by an accident at a dinner-table, at the scattering or outpouring upon the ground, of what, even on the lowest view, was a substance under which the Most Holy had been pleased to impart Himself to those who had faith to discern Him.*

* A Catholic priest of our acquaintance, whilst visiting at a great hospital in London, once remonstrated with a Protestant clergyman for casting the superfluous elements, after communica-

This brief and imperfect sketch of a large subject has been incidentally suggested by Mr. Dale's careful and improved translation of Baldeschi's work, named at the head of the present article. Strictly speaking, indeed, our remarks do not directly apply to Mr. Dale's book, which is mainly concerned with a department of ceremonial religion rather different from that which we have sought to illustrate. We have throughout been arguing upon ceremonies in their simplest, most elementary form; whereas Mr. Dale presents us with that portion only of Baldeschi's Treatise which relates, for the most part, to the correct carrying out of what are technically called "Functions," that is to say, Church celebrations upon a grand and imposing scale. But it would be a great injustice to Mr. Dale to withhold from him the praise of having largely contributed by his present volume to ceremonial exactitude and propriety in the whole province of external worship. Were it indeed possible (as we hold that it certainly is not) to promote magnificent and costly ceremonies to the disparagement of those which fall more immediately in the way of the Church's regular work, we should have little reason to feel gratitude to the author who had given his help to such an object. For that would have been to reduce the ceremonial system of the Church to the very degradation from which we have been so desirous of raising it. It would have been to sanction the mere Protestant view of it as a kind of science of Church theatricals. But happily any such attempt would be no less futile than mischievous. The architecture of cathedrals and palaces is not a distinct study from architecture in general. And as decorative art is but a branch of all art, founded on the same principles, and regulated by the same laws, so the knowledge of ceremonial, in its more elaborate and complicated forms, can be reached only through the study of

ting the sick, into a vessel under the patient's bed. We know, as a fact, that at a church in the Strand, it was formerly the custom for the beadle and clerk to make a repast in the vestry after service, of the remains of the *consecrated* elements. But what could surpass in profaneness, the practice at the universities, of forcing young men to communion, as a matter of college discipline, under penalty of expulsion! It should be added, that on this whole subject, we believe there is now a much improved feeling both at the universities and in the Established Church at large.

the subject in its simplest. But especially is this the case where practice is so necessary to perfection. Every one who has the slightest acquaintance with the administration of a Catholic Church knows perfectly well that the qualities necessary for giving effect to the extraordinary celebrations of the Church cannot be extemporized, but must be acquired through an habitual attention to every the minutest rule of duty in the conduct of regular and daily ministrations; the main conditions of success being, as we opine, the reverence of holy things, and love for the beauty of God's House and Worship. It is, then, because we look upon Mr. Dale's publication as a help towards these dispositions, and not merely, or principally, because it will assist the clergy in carrying out ceremonies which are necessarily but occasional and local, that we hail it as a most useful *vade mecum* of every Catholic Priest, Sacristan, and "Cæremoniarius."*

There is another point of view in which it has far more than a merely official value. Its use cannot but tend to two most important objects; uniformity among ourselves, and conformity with Rome. If there be any weight in the argument of this essay, it is a plain deduction from our remarks that, as ceremony and doctrine are intimately connected, ceremonial uniformity must have an incidental bearing upon doctrinal unity. A neighbouring Church, full of interest to every Catholic, is rapidly extricating itself from the trammels of nationalism, by tending with continually increasing signs of approximation to the centre of Catholic truth and light, the Holy Apostolic See. It would be indeed preposterous were *we* to foster traditions and cling to practices derived from our more privileged neighbours in the days of our own depression; when *they* are coming to regard the very badges of an exploded nationalism with the same eye with which an emancipated captive surveys the manacles which he has happily discarded. But of this conjuncture there is happily no fear. The links which bind England to the Holy See are too many and too strong to leave any reasonable doubt that, by the favour of God, *she* will continually imbibe more and more of the spirit of Roman theology, Roman institutions, and Roman

* Since these pages were in type, we are very glad to see a "Sacristan's Manual" announced by the author whose work we are reviewing.

practices. And this we are sure may be done without any sacrifice of what is really valuable in our national character, true Catholicism being an element which, whether in the individual, or in the community, ever burns up what is base and earthly, while it elevates, purifies, and quickens, whatsoever bears the stamp of a nobler origin, and a higher destination.

ART. IV.—1. *The Life and Opinions of Wycliffe.* By the Rev. R. VAUGHAN. London, Jackson and Walford, 1830.

2. *The Life of Wiclf.* By C. W. LE BAS, M. A. London, Rivingtons, 1832.

3. *John de Wycliffe, a Monograph.* By the Rev. R. VAUGHAN, D.D. London, Seeleys, 1853.

4. *Three Treatises.* By John Wycliffe, D.D. I. Of the Church and her Members.—II. Of the Apostacy of the Church.—III. Of Antichrist, &c. From a MS. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. By JAMES HEATHORN TODD, D. D. Dublin, Hodges and Smith, 1851.

5. *An Apology for Lollard Doctrines (Attributed to Wycliffe).* By the same Editor. London, 1842.

THE name of Wycliffe marks an era. It represents far more than the rise of a heresy. It embodies the history of an age. It symbolizes the formal manifestation of a foul and sordid spirit, which had long been latent, and was ere long to be rampant, in the realm; a spirit which had first infused its own worldliness into the Church and then assailed her for the infection; which found in the wealth of the Church a temptation, and made it an accusation; and which reproached her with covetousness while coveting her riches. It was an age in which kings were robbers upon theory, and sought to veil their rapacity with the mask of hypocrisy, an age in which pharisaical puritanism began to discover pious pretexts for plunder, and lent to spoliation the sanction of religion. Of the spirit of this age Wycliffe was the impersonation and the expression. His life was

coeval with the long and eventful reign of the third Edward, in which the seeds were sown of the fatal schism of the Reformation. He was the chosen champion of those principles of sanctimonious spoliation which then met their consummation. Throughout his career, having the Crown for his patron, and profiting by its patronage, he laboured on the clearest motives of self-interest, in advancing its ecclesiastical influence, and depressing that of the Holy See. He had elected to be the servant of the Crown. He could not serve God and Mammon. He was, therefore, the enemy of the Church.

His industry, thus stimulated by interest, was ever active. His writings were prolific, and, even before the age of printing, were much multiplied. They first taught spoliation as a principle, and sacrilege as a theory. They laid the axe at the root of the authority of the Holy See, and laid the foundation of the Supremacy of the Crown. He was the servile tool and ready instrument of royal tyranny and rapacity: and was the apologist by anticipation for all the plunders of a later age. It is not surprising that in that age his works should have been revived, and his writings eagerly had recourse to by the supporters of schism and spoliation. So long ago as 1525, one of his works was republished in Germany, and in 1546 another; and doubtless they were among those pernicious tracts, transmitted for surreptitious circulation in this country to advance the cause of the Reformation. Dr. Todd republished his "Last Age of the Church," and one or two other treatises of his. When that schism was consummated, its advocates still resorted to the writings of Wycliffe as an irresistible armoury of weapons against the Church. In 1608 several were republished by Dr. James, who put forth an apology for him from Oxford; and in 1612, another was published by the learned Henry Jackson, of the same University. Lord Coke adverts to the authority of Wycliffe, in his elaborate arguments on behalf of the royal supremacy, later in the same century. In the early part of the last century, a Mr. Lewis published a work on the Life and Writings of Wycliffe: and at the commencement of the present century a Mr. Baker republished what is called, without much right or reason, "Wycliffe's Translation of the Bible." Twenty years ago, Dr. Vaughan, one of the very few men of any learning, whom the Nonconformists possess, published a very elab-

borated Life of Wycliffe, with a more careful account of his writings than had before appeared. And soon after Mr. Le Bas, on behalf of the Established Church, put forth a more compact Biography of the "Reformer," along with a Life of Cranmer, and others of a similar character, in a series of Lives of "British Divines," forming part of a "Theological Library," of the most orthodox and approved description, for the "Anglican communion." All this was before we had begun our literary existence, and therefore, as this is not a Retrospective Review, we should scarcely have been able to avail ourselves of these rich and varied stores of materials, had it not been that Dr. Vaughan, after the lapse of twenty years, has returned, with all the ardour of a first love, to the subject of his former labours, and embodied the result in a work which, if less elaborate, is at least more elegant than his previous essay.

All this evinces an exalted idea of Wycliffe among Protestants of all sects, Episcopalian or Nonconformist. Not a very consistent kind of admiration, seeing that High-Churchmen must find in him too much of Puritanism; and Low-Churchmen, or No-Churchmen, enough of Popery to make a Puseyite. But the feeling arises from an erroneous idea that Wycliffe was the parent of the Reformation. He was its precursor, but not its parent. He did not originate its principles from conviction; he adopted them rather from policy, or from necessity. The incongruity of opinions exhibited by his eulogists was exceeded by his own. They at least, and on principle, unite in opposition to Rome. But he was her enemy only from passion, or interest. Like others who have originated heresies, he never meant to end where he did. He began by appealing to Rome, and only became her foe after she declined to be his tool. His was a career characterized at once by tergiversation and truculence. His own conduct convicted him of hypocrisy. His inconsistency betrayed both selfishness and insincerity. A king's chaplain—he was the champion of the crown against the Church. A pluralist—he wrote against preferment. Acknowledging the Pope as God's Vicar upon earth, he wreaked his revenge, or pleased his patrons, by loading him with coarse abuse. While writing against the Sacrament of Penance he continued to administer it; and after blaspheming the Adorable Sacrifice, he still ceased not to offer it, and was stricken down by the hand of God in the

very act of committing the abominable impiety. Thus he lived and died, trading in sacrilege, *selling* his blasphemy, making a market of his heresy, and, at the same time, for sordid pelf, still wearing the livery of orthodoxy. The history of heresy affords no more humble instance of depravity! And this is the man whom Protestants, zealous, pious, and learned, select for canonization as their mediæval Apostle and Confessor.

The works of Dr. Vaughan, and Mr. Le Bas, are really marvels of hallucination. Both these modern admirers of Wycliffe saw that his biography could only be a portion of the history of his age, and could scarcely be understood apart from it. Accordingly, both of them prefix laboured introductory dissertations as to the state of England before his appearance.

In perusing these dissertations, we are irresistibly prompted to exclaim, with Dr. Newman, “Oh the *one-sidedness* of Protestantism!” It surely never was more amusingly illustrated, never exhibited itself in a more ludicrous accumulation of inconsistencies and absurdities. So gross and glaring are the inconsistencies, that out of their own mouths we can destroy their case. We give the precedence to Mr. Le Bas, because, as a Churchman, he ought to be a little nearer to sense and truth in his views than his Nonconformist coadjutor. After speaking of the Catholic Church, in the strain of the most excited of Exeter Hall incendiaries, as Mystery of Iniquity, Babylon, Mother of Harlots, &c., &c., he proceeds to describe the conversion of the kingdom to this horrible Church, at the instigation of the benign Gregory the Great, and informs his readers that “Augustine was the leader of this venerable mission,” and “that he eventually conferred upon the country the blessings of a pure and humanizing religion.” He goes on to state, in terms, which, were it not for the atrocity of his language elsewhere, would indicate a candid spirit, that “the monastic system obtained a surprising predominance, and powerfully advanced the work of civilization, and that the effect was “to soften the asperities of life, and tame the devotion to war and bloodshed.” He goes on to say, “the spirit and energy of the Saxon Church was long kept up by its continued intercourse with Rome;” “the meagre literature of the country was invigorated and enriched by the learning and the talent of a long series of *foreign*

prelates," (we beg particular attention to all this; it will be found most important,) "among whom the name of Theodore, the seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, stands nobly conspicuous"—this prelate, exercising, be it observed, the power of Papal legate, and most energetically upholding the Supremacy of the Holy See. Now, what have we on the very next page? Why, as a worthy prologue to the biography of the heretic who spent his life in traducing the monastic orders, and abusing the Holy See, and coarsely calumniating the Catholic Church, we have some vulgar vilification of St. Dunstan, who did but strive to reform those orders; and St. Thomas, who did but seek to uphold that Church; the soul and centre of which, as this writer himself has just before represented, was the Holy See, and the blessed fruits of which he had just before described in the civilization of the kingdom. The Catholic reader will be surprised and amused to hear that St. Dunstan's grand object was "to erect the Benedictine Order on the ruins of the national Church!" So much for the learning of the reverend writer. For his candour let this single specimen suffice: "The whole scheme of our ecclesiastical polity in those ages was framed and consolidated by the energy and intelligence of Archbishop Theodore, who established an uniformity of discipline and government throughout the Churches, under the Primacy of Canterbury," omitting to add, "*and the Supremacy of the Holy See*," of which Theodore was as much the advocate and legate, as was St. Dunstan or St. Thomas. The inconsistency which can eulogize the one as an enlightened prelate, and stigmatize the other as unscrupulous and atrocious—is past all comprehension. All we can say of it is, that the biographer is certainly worthy of his hero in this respect, and this resemblance our readers will ere long recognize and appreciate. Passing on in his review of the religious history of the age, he speaks of the "intelligent firmness" of "Henry Beauclerc," in opposition to the unprincipled aggression of "Thomas à Becket." As it is very material that our readers should have a true estimate of the character of the royal and noble rebels against the Church in those turbulent times, we will just cite a sentence or two from the chronicler, to give them an idea of the "intelligent firmness" of Henry. "The king was violently excited, and sent round letters to the sheriffs" * * "to seize the fathers, mothers, brothers

and sisters, nephews and nieces, of all the clerks who were with the Archbishop." "The king also commanded the Church of Canterbury, and all the goods of the archbishop and the clerks to be confiscated, *and banished all his kindred, an act unheard of in all former history—without regard to condition, sex, or age!*"* So much for the "intelligent firmness" of Henry II. And all for what? Because St. Thomas had made an appeal to the Supremacy of the Holy See, which Theodore had done before him, and the beneficial influence of which the author had himself acknowledged in the history of the Saxon Church! The reverend writer tells us, "the subject of controversy between Henry and Becket, was the total immunity of ecclesiastics from civil jurisdiction," "and that the question was, whether the power of the sceptre should bow down before that of the crozier, and the State be absorbed in that of the Church." We need scarcely say the "controversy" was mainly, as to whether the Crown should really confer the jurisdiction of the Episcopate, (as in the Established Church is the case at this moment,) and whether the final appeal on all questions should not be from the Archbishop to the Crown, as recently exemplified in the Gorham case; and further, that the "question" was, whether the lay power should be exercised over all ecclesiastical causes,† in the very words used in the "bidding prayer" in all our cathedrals, wherein the queen's jurisdiction is acknowledged (with most ill-timed loyalty,) as "over all causes civil and ecclesiastical supreme." It would have perplexed this consistent writer who eulogizes St. Augustine and Theodore, to prove anything in that which St. Thomas contended for beyond what they put in practice.

Our readers will by this time be prepared to question the qualification even of the *episcopalian* biographer of Wycliffe for the task of a truthful historian. But we have devoted time enough to his view of the history of the age which heralded the appearance of Wycliffe, and we must hasten to present our own, taking up the thread of history at the time of St. Thomas.

It will be found very material to notice that even at the height of Henry's anger against the saint, when he had

* Roger de Wendover, A. D. 1169.

† Roger de Wendover, A. D. 1164.

confiscated the temporalities of his see, he said, "Let Peter's Pence be still collected and kept."* We need not do more than remind our reader, that this acknowledgement of the supremacy of the Holy See had been paid ever since the establishment of that Anglo-Saxon church, of which the biographer of Wycliffe speaks so approvingly;† although afterwards (it will hardly be credited,) he represents, in order to vindicate Wycliffe for encouraging Edward III. to refuse it, that it was imposed on the nation by John. Passing this by for the present, we find in the reign of Henry III. a violent and malignant feeling arising—from the meanest and most selfish motives—against such of the clergy as held benefices upon papal presentations, "provisors," as they were termed. The exercise of this right of presentation had been coeval with the establishment of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and that it had been exercised beneficially could be proved out of the mouth of Wycliffe's biographer; for Mr. Le Bas, it will have been observed, speaks of the "learning and talent of a long series of foreign prelates," who had been appointed by the Holy See, and it is scarcely necessary to say that the English clergy at that time were often so ignorant as to be ill qualified for episcopal or even pastoral preferment. There is internal evidence in the accounts of the proceedings of those who have so violently opposed the exercise of this right of papal presentation, that they were actuated by vulgar and narrow-minded feelings, partly of low jealousy of foreigners, but chiefly of envious covetousness. We find that they raised conspiracies to terrify people from paying tithes to the "Romish clergy," as they were termed, (i.e. those holding benefices under Papal presentation,) by "*threats of their property being burnt*," and that the conspirators perpetrated the most outrageous robberies. And when, upon the indignant remonstrances of the Holy See, inquiries were instituted into the authors of these outrages, it was discovered that they were committed with the privity of certain of the king's ministers, and by secret warrants from the king's judiciary!

And these were the men—we are speaking of a period a century preceding the birth of Wycliffe—who, with the

* Roger de Wendover, A.D. 1164.

† Roger de Wendover, A.D. 1231.

hypocrisy of selfishness, complained of the “rapacity” of the Holy See, and resisted all those appeals for assistance and support, whether by way of first-fruits, or tenths, which in better days of the English Church were so cordially and readily responded to. And yet there was no answering the argument upon which the appeals were founded, and which we thus find stated by the Chronicler. “The Apostolic See not being rich enough, the Pope was forced by necessity to beg assistance from the Sons of the Church; and he besought them—as natural sons of the Church of Rome, which is the mother of all Churches—to give such assistance to her—but, if they failed in so doing, the whole body should fall away.”* How on earth was the Holy See to be supported as the central seat of Christendom—in an age when it had to struggle with brutal aggression—except by the common contributions of Christendom? And on what broader or stronger ground could the claims of Rome be based, than her spiritual maternity and supremacy, unless, indeed, it were the fact that already she was recognized as the common home of the oppressed,—the asylum of the exiled—the chair of justice, to which the injured and the wronged made their last resort? To such an appeal, upon such grounds, none but the most sordid minds could be insensible; and it shows how deeply the evil spirit of avarice—the accursed love of money—had eaten into the hearts of those of the clergy, not less than the laity, by whom these claims of Rome were either responded to reluctantly, or were insolently resisted.

The biographers of Wycliffe glory in the fact that among the opponents of these reasonable claims of Rome was the celebrated Grostete, and they claim him as a precursor and exemplar for their hero; whether Grostete would have approved of his successor we more than question, for the illustrious bishop of Lincoln, although rebellious, was never heretical. It shows in almost an amusing manner the one-sidedness of Protestantism, that the Protestant writers, who are keenly alive to the “rapacity” of the Popes in making these appeals for pecuniary aid, appear utterly unconscious of the avarice which must have dictated a resistance to them. Why is love of money more manifested in a request for pecuniary aid than a refusal of it? Why should not the holders of rich benefices con-

* Wendover, A.D. 1221.

tribute to the necessities of Rome? They held them only on trust for the good of the Church, and the glory of God: of that Church they believed Rome to be the Head; and in the Roman See they professed to see seated the Vicar and Vicegerent of God upon earth; what but sordid selfishness, then, whispered that grudging of money to this great spiritual Parent, which prompted Grostete to such rebellion—and blinded him so as to cause him to plunder the religious houses in his diocese at the very time when he was resisting the reasonable claims of Rome? There is something really diverting in the gravity with which Wycliffe's biographer delighted to get hold of a bishop grumbling against the Holy See, represents him as exclaiming, when in the eternal city: “Oh, money! money! how vast is the power everywhere; how irresistible at Rome!” How incurable the self-delusion which prevented him from seeing that it was far more powerful at Lincoln than at Rome, and prevents his admirers from seeing that it was as powerful at Lutterworth as at Lincoln.

We have already adverted to the fierce feelings of envy and jealousy which had arisen against clergymen who received papal presentations to benefices. An incident which occurred just a century before, towards the close of the reign of Henry III., will illustrate the spirit which generated such feelings. Mathew of Westminster informs us that in 1260, a detestable murder was committed under the following circumstances: A prebend of St. Paul's had died in Italy, and, according to the ecclesiastical usage, the Pope had presented one of the secular clergy of noble birth, an Englishman, but, on account of the feelings before mentioned, all who received such presentations were nicknamed “Romans.” Not knowing of this presentation, the King had given the prebend to “Lord John de Crakehall his treasurer, already an enormously rich man, archdeacon of Bedford;” of whom we read shortly after that he died, leaving the sum of £18,000 (a large amount in those days,) behind him. When the papal presentee attempted to take possession of the prebend house, (the Primate having decided in his favour,) he was denied entrance, and forced by violence and arms to withdraw. “And *they who occupied the house*” (servants of the Archdeacon) “presently followed him, and among the crowd *some one* clove his head in two between the eyes, and escaped without being discovered.” “But though by

some suspicious persons" (says the Chronicler), "it might be supposed that this had been procured to be done by the treasurer, yet in reality he was innocent, and it was done by *some envious rascals*: for the English were indignant that so many Romans should be enriched with English benefices, and wished by a deed of this kind to deter for the future from such continual invasion of this country." That is to say, the sordid minions of the Court—already gorged with wealth—yet seeking to increase it; eager to engross all the patronage of the Church, sought by savage murder to revenge themselves on those whom the Holy See selected as fitter than themselves for the service of the altar.

And these were the men who hypocritically declaimed on all occasions against the "rapacity" of Rome, and resisted her reasonable requests for contributions; never exceeding a tenth. Yet, in one year, Edward I., (our "English Justinian," as Protestant historians call him, because he was an oppressor and plunderer of the Church,) compelled the clergy to give him a *moiety* of all their possessions—merely for the purpose of his unprincipled aggression. The mean-minded men who in him fostered and flattered a rapacity of which they falsely accused the Holy See,—sought to repay themselves at the expense of the Church for his exactions; and by means of his patronage requited themselves for his plunder. Hence those who were loudest in complaints of the "rapacity" of Rome were most submissive to the rapacity of the Crown, and most eager to repay themselves by procuring royal presentations to rich benefices; of course they were zealous in upholding the royal "prerogative" in this respect, and in resisting papal presentations and appeals to Rome.

Among the petitions to Parliament in the reign of Edward I., there is one in which "William de Nottingham, clericus petit quod possit prosequi appellacionem suam in curia Romana. Rex non concessit quod privilegium suum infringat sed impetrat intra regium se sibi videret expedire."* The effect of preventing an appeal to Rome was to render the sovereign absolute. Lord Coke cites a case as having occurred in the same reign, in which the king had presented a clerk to a benefice, who

was refused by the archbishop, because the Pope, by *provisions*, had conferred it on another. The king brought a suit against the archbishop: that is to say, in the king's own courts, and the archbishop pleaded the Papal proviso, which was adjudged a *contempt* by the king's judges, for which his temporalities were seized! What manner of man Edward was may be seen from another case cited by Coke, with great glee. "In the time of Edward I., for that one notified an excommunication by the Pope against the king's treasurer—the king would have had him drawn and hung, only the chancellor knelt before him, and it was accorded that the man should abjure the realms."*

It is most important that the reader should have a vivid idea of the exactions and extortions of the Sovereign from the Church in the age in which Wycliffe appeared; for it will very much tend to throw a light on his conduct and character. In 1294 (we have now arrived at a time only preceding by a quarter of a century the date of his birth,) we read that the king demanded of the whole Church a *moiety* of all their possessions! "The prelates and clergy were disturbed and alarmed, and groaning in anguish of spirit"—"when a knight rose up in the midst of them, and said: 'My venerable men, this is the demand of the king: the annual moiety of the revenues of your churches. And if any one object to this, let him rise up, *that his person may be recognized as guilty of treason.*'—"When they heard this, the prelates were disturbed, and immediately agreed to the king's demands."† Next year he demanded a tenth. The year after another similar extortion being attempted, and there being symptoms of opposition, "the king, being changed at once into a cruel tyrant, gave his servants permission to seize the property of the clergy or religious orders, as if they were his revenues, and prohibited all advocates from pleading before any secular courts in their behalf." "He also commanded every one who had received ordination *voluntarily to offer* him a *fifth part* of their revenues, *or else he would strip them of all their property.* Some of them at once complied with this command, being prelates in the king's court, but as to the care of souls, manifest Pilates; hoping by that conduct to bring over the rest; after which the

* Cited, Year Book, 31 Edw. III. 9.

† Matthew of Westminster, A. D. 1294—7.

sheriffs seized all the property of the clergy ; nor could the clergy ride out in safety, on account of the violence of the soldiers, in consequence of the licence of the king." From the next and other similar passages we gather that the Holy See, in order to protect the Church from these horrible oppressions, had prohibited the clergy from yielding to such exactions without its consent. " The prelates feared if they granted anything they would receive excommunication, and if they did not give they would not escape the merciless hands of those robbers." Such was the state of things at the close of the long reign of Edward I. Before his death he acknowledged his oppressions, and they were alternately repeated and acknowledged by his successor Edward III., who on one occasion made an iniquitous attempt to crush the Primate by a process which he afterwards had to admit was contrary to justice and to truth.*

In 1346 we find the commons praying the king (Edward III.), that if any bring any bull or letter of the Pope, touching the business of alien bishops, abbots, &c., that he be *out of the law*,—which the king accordingly decrees.† The meaning of being "out of the law" was, that any man might kill him, as an enemy of the crown.† This was adjudged to be the law by the servile judges, those slaves of the Crown, who adjudged any thing to be law which the Sovereign, or rather the strongest party in the country, desired to be so decided. This was *no statute* of the realm ; it was not passed or entered as such ; it was an ordinance of the Crown by consent of the Commons ; it had not the assent of *Parliament*, comprising the Peers ; it had no authority of law. Yet in the next year we find the servile judges condemning a man on this so-called "statute" (which was no statute at all), because he had asserted his right, under a Papal "provision," against a royal presentation, and he was adjudged to *perpetual imprisonment*, utterly in violation of law, by a mere exercise of arbitrary power under the colour of the forms of law. §

In 1350 we find on the Rolls another entry, that the

* Lingard, vol. iv. c. 1.

† Rot. Parl. 20 Edw. III. 41.

‡ Jenk. 199, Pl. 17, cites 24 Hen. VIII. S. P. Hawk, Pl. C. 55, c. xix. s. 46.

§ Year-Book, 21 Edw. III, Mich. T. 42.

king had sent letters to certain English clerks at Rome, who had done (as it was alleged) certain things against his crown, (i. e., were prosecuting appeals against his wicked judges,) commanding them to return and answer before his council.* And one Roger Holme, for not coming accordingly, was, so soon as he returned, seized, and his possessions confiscated. The cruelty and tyranny of all this will be apparent when it is recollected that the law *recognized* appeals to Rome and Bulls from Rome as our legal records and reports of that age amply testify.† The established religion was the Roman Catholic, of which a vital principle was, the supremacy of the Holy See and the right of appeal to that See in all ecclesiastical causes. So by these "wise and enlightened" Princes their subjects were to be "drawn and hung," imprisoned and plundered, for exercising rights which their religion and their laws equally recognized.

It was probably found difficult to satisfy people of the justice of convicting men under the iniquitous and illegal ordinance of 1346, for claiming benefices by virtue of papal provisions; so in 1350 we have the celebrated statute of "provisors of benefices," exposing them to the penalties of *præmunire*. The readers, not merely of the old English chroniclers, but of such modern and even Protestant writers as Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, are sufficiently aware how opposed was this statute to the practice and principles of the English Church from its first foundation. It may be safely asserted, that from the time of Wilfrid to the days of Wycliffe the papal right of provision had been exercised, and with the greatest benefit to the Church and country, rescuing it in a great degree from the curse of local interest and royal patronage, and tending to raise the character of our clergy and prelacy, by importing into benefices and bishoprics men eminent for learning and piety. We should be well content to compare the character of papal and royal presentees, and to let the cause of Rome stand or fall by the comparison. We are spared the trouble of applying the test, for the biographer of Wycliffe has done it for us, in the remarkable admission, that the character of our clergy had been elevated by a series of *foreign* prelates of learning and piety. Of course papal provisors

* Rot. Parl. 24 Edw. III. 13.

† Year-Book, 7 Edw. III. 8.

need not *necessarily* be foreigners, but they often were ; and this not unnaturally excited national jealousy, and not less the jealousy of the Crown than of the clergy, for the foreign prelates were not likely to be so subservient to the Crown as the natives. Though provisors need not be foreigners, foreign prelates were sure to be provisors ; and the admission we have alluded to, establishes the great fact, that they were not unworthy but valuable appointments.

The oppressive and aggressive character of the Crown in those days, as respects the Church, can be proved very clearly, curiously enough out of the mouth of the very Parliament which passed the Statute of provisors. In the same year, 1350, it was recited in other statutes, that before that time our lord the king hath taken title to present to benefices at the suggestion of many clerks, where the title hath not been true ; and such clerks have been received, against God and good faith.* That is to say, servile clergymen, hunters after preferment, had often persuaded the king to assume and assert a right of patronage when he had no such right. We very much mistake if it will not appear that Wycliffe was one of this pernicious class ; hangers-on of princes, flatterers and panderers to the great ones of the earth, for the sake of selfish and sordid interest. The provision of the statute of provisors, as plainly manifested by its preamble, points to men like these as its procurers and promoters. Its scope and spirit is simply *sordid*. The sole reasons alleged by it are, that "a great part of the treasure of the realm is carried out of the realm," and *also* "that many clerks" ('clerks' of the class just referred to) "*advanced in this realm by their true Patrons*, which have peaceably holden their *advancement* by long time, be suddenly put out," i. e., "put out," because they were not proper for their preferment, or because they had procured it improperly, by a little bribery or mean subserviency. That this was the sort of men who procured this statute is palpable from the spirit which marks these words, in speaking as they do of the sacred office of the priesthood as matters of "patronage" and "advancement," and betraying all the eagerness of an envious covetousness.

We have now reached the period of Wycliffe's life. The year 1328 was a marked one for England. It saw

* 25 Edw. III. c. 3.

the birth of Chaucer and of Wycliffe. These men, unlike as they were in many respects,—the one radiant in all the charms of poetry, the other gloomy in the austerity of puritanical heresy,—yet had a fellow feeling and a common aim. That feeling was, the aversion of the evil for the good; that aim was, the desire to render the good odious or ridiculous. They worked with different weapons, but they served the same master, and laboured in the same spirit, a spirit of bitter hostility to the Church. There is something alike ominous and curious in one of the circumstances which marks so strikingly the same feature in their character and career. Wycliffe commenced his public course by violent animosity against the mendicant orders; and the first and almost the only fact we can get at in the life of Chaucer is, that he was once fined for beating a Franciscan friar in Fleet Street.

It is not an idea only of our own that Chaucer and Wycliffe were consciously or unconsciously, to a great extent, coadjutors in the accursed work of hostility to the Church. The same idea has occurred to the biographers of both. The spirit of the poet did not lead him so far as the heretic; but they went a long way together, and the one in a great degree did the work of the other. It is remarkable how at this era, which marks the first rise of Puritanical principles, we find their defenders, working by the same bad weapons as at the period of the Reformation,—the weapons of wholesale slander and irreligious ridicule. Chaucer did the ridicule, Wycliffe the slander. One brought malice, the other humour, to the work. The biographers of Wycliffe are apparently proud of the sympathy between these two very different spirits. They are unconscious or regardless of the stigma it attaches to their apostle. Are they aware—they can hardly but be aware—(although they take care not to draw their readers' attention to it) what was the character of the writings of Chaucer? Do they know that they are so obscene, that they are not fit for the perusal of youth?—and we hear the President of one of our colleges recently refused the present of a copy of his works for the Students' Library. Such was the man who was the worthy associate of Wycliffe in the endeavour to cast obloquy on the clergy secular and regular of the Church. The one, the apostle of iniquity, the other of malignity; apt accomplices in the accursed object of sapping the piety

of a people by coarse and reckless ridicule and envenomed invective. We repeat, it is not our idea only that these were accomplices. The biographer of Wycliffe represents Chaucer as his admirer, and from striking coincidences of their writings we think truly so. We must not, however, anticipate.

The first appearance of Wycliffe was as a pretender to prophecy. We allude to his "Last Age of the World," put forth in 1356, in which he maintained that the fourteenth century was "the Last Age," and that the world was to come to an end at the end of it! His biographers appear ashamed of this, and one of them gravely observes: "As a prophetic work, this tract of Wycliffe is of course entirely worthless." He adds, however, (truly enough, in a different sense from what he intends,) that "it is extremely valuable as a manifestation of the vigour with which he was girding himself up for a conflict with the powers and principalities of the Papal Empire." "He loudly and keenly arraigned the vices of the clergy," declaring that they ate up the people like bread. It may be remarked *en passant* that if this were true, it amply accounts for the resistance they made to the reasonable appeals of Rome for assistance: since avarice is not an unusual accompaniment of covetousness. But *was* it true? That is to say, was it true,—not partially, but universally, or at all events, widely and generally? for this is the way in which Wycliffe puts it. It is obvious that upon this question at the outset depends altogether his character for truth, and integrity, and sincerity. Upon this issue, in short, must depend whether he was a "Reformer" or a slanderer. It is obviously a most material, a vital issue. How do his biographers deal with it? They *shirk* it. They shrink from it. With wilful onesidedness they simply take *his* account of the matter, or the account of those who resembled him, and without any careful and candid examination of contemporary writers, in open violation of the clearest facts of history, they quietly assume all that this foul-mouthed slanderer says of the clergy of this country, secular and regular, or at least treat the question in this disingenuous sort of style: "If the representation does not outrageously exceed the truth, the clergy of that age were the pests of society, &c., &c. They were, many of them, if we believe their accuser, infamous for ostentation, sensuality, and avarice." Yes; but *was* it so? How far

was it so? Wycliffe does not say merely that many of them were, &c. That little word is slyly slipped in by his biographer, who had no scruple perhaps as to adopting altogether the wholesale vituperations of the apostle, (for whose excesses of language, by-the-bye, his eulogists often half apologise,) and *he* would have it understood that the bulk and body of the clergy were as he represents them. As to the monastic orders, indeed, especially the *mendicants*, his language exceeds all conception, and really may be characterised as ruffianly; *almost* as ruffianly as some of the Homilies of the Church of England on the same subject.* It is obvious to any Catholic, that even if there were any ground for his accusations, it would scarcely serve to justify so malicious and reckless a diffusion of them. On the other hand, if (as even his biographers sometimes seem to suspect) they are not generally or widely true, that is decisive as to his character, and must brand him as a malignant slanderer. What is the truth, then, as to this? And if the truth were not with him, what was the real reason or motive of all this malignity? In contemporary history we shall find a clue to right conclusions on both these questions, which his biographers have unaccountably disregarded. As to the character of the friars and writers before Wycliffe thus accused them we are spared any trouble, for his biographers are compelled to admit that even Grostete highly appreciated them and patronized them; encouraging them at the University of Oxford, and himself lecturing in their schools. It is amusing to observe the difficulty in which this places them. Wycliffe's wholesale vilification of the friars obliges his biographers to vindicate his vituperation, and yet he himself speaks highly of Grostete, who was their great patron. They suggest, in order to escape this difficulty, that Grostete afterwards altered his opinion, or that the friars altered their character. The first suggestion is not without foundation; but then the fact must be taken with its explanation. The reason rather redounds to his disgrace than to their discredit. Grostete had quarrelled with the Holy See simply because his love of money led him to resist its call for accustomed contributions, and the friars were the great advocates of the Holy See. The first

* See especially the Treatise "Of the Church and her Members," edited by Dr. Todd, pp. xxxii. et seq.

suggestion does not thus much damage the friars. And the other we shall dispose of speedily. Within the half century after Wycliffe's death we find the friars patronized by laymen like Whittington,* and churchmen like William of Wykeham. It is true that in 1344 we find the illustrious Richard de Bury speaking against them, a few years before the period when Wycliffe first assailed them; but he was only inspired by a little literary jealousy, on account of the acquisitions the friars made in books, for which he impeached them as violating their rule of poverty. So that his accusations do not much harm them. A recent Protestant writer of candour says very justly, "About this time the mendicant friars were treated with undeserved contempt, and much ill feeling arose against them among the clergy; but the *clergy were somewhat prejudiced in their judgment.*"† The restricted censures of Richard de Bury had no resemblance to the envenomed invectives of Wycliffe, and were accompanied by handsome eulogies on their love of literature, characterizing them, as "not selfish hoarders, but meet professors of enlightened knowledge."‡ The reasons of the jealousy against them may be gathered from the writings of others. One of their opponents was Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh. He was, like Wycliffe, an Oxford man, and he laments the *decrease of students there, through the friars.* He says, "In my tyme, in the university of Oxenford were thirty thousand scolers at ones, and now there be scarcely sixe thousand." This he ascribes to the "freres." "In each convent of freres is a noble librarye and a grete." It is pretty plain that the University men were envious of the superior scholarship of the "freres." The recent writer just quoted says, "The Dominicans and Franciscans were renowned for profound learning and passion for knowledge. They caused a powerful change in the ecclesiastical and collegiate learning of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries."§ "They appear as intellectual crusaders against the prevailing ignorance and sloth." "The finest names that adorn the literary annals

* The celebrated Lord Mayor of London. He built them a convent.

† Merryweather's *Bibliomania*, p. 78.

‡ *Philobiblia*, trans. by Ingle, p. 56. § *Bibliomania*, p. 195.

of those centuries were begging friars." He refers to a list of one hundred and twenty-two authors of the Franciscan order alone,* and he quotes the following passage from a letter of Edward II. to the Pope: "Desiderantes itaque, pater sancte, ordinis fratrum prædicatorum Oxonii uti religionis devotio, et honestatis laudabilis decer viget, per quem etiam honor universitatis Oxoniensis, et utilitas ibidem studentium."† He informs us that the Franciscan convent at Oxford contained two libraries, one for the use of the graduates, and one for the secular students, who did not belong to their order, but were receiving instruction from them. Wood states: "The friars of all orders, especially the Franciscans, used so diligently to procure all monuments of literature from all parts, that wise men *looked upon it as an injury to laymen*, who therefore found a difficulty in getting any books." There was clearly a *literary* jealousy of the friars. And in this undoubtedly Wycliffe partook. He was Professor at Oxford, and at his time the college halls were comparatively deserted, through the superior attractions of the Friars. There was also the jealousy of the secular clergy, as already alluded to; and in this again Wycliffe would participate. It is expressed by his fellow-labourer Chaucer, in his *Canterbury Tales*; and repeatedly betrays itself in Wycliffe's writings. Yet he also abuses the secular clergy for worldliness; and if there were any ground of accusation against them on that score, this alone would amply explain their alleged aversion to the friars. But be it observed, that it was *not* the secular clergy that he first assailed, but the *friars*. And it is perfectly plain that he assailed them as a slanderer; and that his, moreover, was the vilest species of slander, since it was self-interested, mercenary, and sordid; because as the authorities of the University (who, be it remembered, were *Church Patrons*) had a literary jealousy against them, they would not be displeased with their censor. ¶

But there were deeper and deadlier sources of jealousy and hostility against the religious orders, more especially the mendicants. They were more devoted to the Holy See, more faithful to the Church, and less subservient to the state power than the secular clergy, who were, by rea-

* Steven's *Monasticon*, vol. ii. p. 193.

† Dugdale's *Monasticon*, vol. vi. p. 1492.

son of the system of patronage, inseparable from an established Church, rendered more dependent upon the Crown and the aristocracy. This was the real reason, on the one hand, for the legislative 'oppressions' perpetrated upon the religious orders by means of the mortmain laws, which were originally aimed only at them, although afterwards extended to the whole Church; and on the other hand, for a jealousy on the part of the secular clergy for those intrepid advocates of the papal supremacy, who, by their preaching, impliedly, and perhaps often explicitly, rebuked their own tepidity and subserviency. Certain it is, that all through the period in which Wycliffe lived, the University of Oxford was characterized by that species of sycophancy to royalty which was predisposed to extend even to heresy, if anti-papal, something like sympathy. And as the poverty of the friars rendered them more impervious to the seductions of patronage, and more staunch in their adherence to the Holy See, they were exposed to the fellest assaults of all who pandered to the rapacity of royalty and the tyranny of secular power.

Foremost among them stood Wycliffe. In the few years which followed the appearance of his first fanatical pamphlet in 1356, he had become conspicuous for coarse invectives against the friars. In a single sentence sometimes a great deal of character is conveyed; and one, very short one, we will cite, as exceedingly expressive of Wycliffe's. "God says that evil teachers been (i. e., have been) the cause of destruction of the people, and Grostete declares it will; and friars have been the principal evil teachers, they been the principal cause of destroying this world."* Every one will see here an insane malignity almost approaching to absurdity, when it is remembered that the order of friars had not been established much above a century, and had been of the greatest advantage to the country by their piety and learning. The only authority he can vouch against them is that of "the great clerk" (as he calls him) Grostete, who had been, as we have seen, one of the most ardent admirers of the friars until he had rebelled against the Holy See, and naturally came to hate its zealous defenders. This was the secret of the aversion for the friars entertained by many of the great in those days. But for their character, we think the

* Wycliffe against the Order of Friars, c. 26.
VOL. XXXV—NO. LXX.

testimony of men like Whittington and Wykeham would outweigh a hundred *interested* maligners such as Wycliffe. We say *interested*; and the facts, precedent or subsequent, show that it was so. Wycliffe paid court to the powerful all through his life. At first it was the authorities of the University. We have seen they disliked the friars, who rebuked their subserviency to royalty. They had rich livings in their gift. And Wycliffe, as we shall see, had a desire for rich livings. And so Wycliffe abused the friars, and declared that they were “evil teachers.” Throughout the career of Wycliffe will be observed this odious mixture of malignity and hypocrisy. It is one contemptible tissue of truculence and selfishness. It has one remarkable characteristic: he is always on the safe side, on the side of the strong against the weak, on the side of patronage and power. He brought himself first into notice by his ravings against the friars. He could not have been ignorant that the authorities of the University had a jealousy against them. Ere long their unscrupulous assailant received the reward he aspired to. He was made in 1361 Warden of Balliol College, and presented to the rectory of Fellingham, a living of considerable value in the diocese of Lincoln, and which he afterwards exchanged for Ludgershall, in Bucks., a living of less value, but more convenient, as being nearer Oxford. So he had promoted his worldly interest by his conduct up to this time. His biographers do not seem to have observed this. If we mistake not, the reader will remark it all through his career. He who so coarsely abused the friars for “covetise,” became a pluralist and a non-resident incumbent so soon as he could; and obtained these rich boons by pandering to the unworthy prejudices and jealousies of his day. The next step we see him take betrays the same character. He wished to exchange the wardenship of Balliol for that of Catherine’s Hall, which was doubtless more richly endowed. There was an obstacle in the way. The foundation of St. Catherine’s required that the warden should be a monk; Wycliffe, however, got the warden displaced by Archbishop Islip (then old and infirm), and himself appointed in his place. This was so flagrant an injustice, that it can only be ascribed to the Primate’s infirmity, and was so ascribed by his successor, who at once reversed the decree and restored the monk. Wycliffe appealed to Rome. Let this be noted. But at the same

time let another fact be noted. In 1363 a statute passed, reciting that citations came from the court of Rome on causes whose cognizance pertaineth to our lord the king and the Royal Court, that is to say, pertaining to the presentations of churches, chapels, and other benefices, abbeys, or priories, &c., occupied in times past and present by divers and notable persons of this realm ;" (language curiously applicable to the wardenship of the priory occupied by Wycliffe under Islip,) it is ordained that all they who *have obtained or shall obtain* in the court of Rome, provostries and other dignities or benefices, pertaining to the presentation of our lord the king or other lay patron ; and also all they which *have obtained* in the said court dignities or benefices, which be occupied at this present time by reasonable title by any person of the realm, or shall obtain hereafter like benefices, shall be arrested, &c., and subject to the penalties of *præmu-nire*."*

Now it was within two years after the passing of this act that Wycliffe's appeal to Rome was pending. His opponents succeeded, and thereby "obtained an office or benefice in the Court of Rome" within this iniquitous statute. We should not be surprised if it passed partly at the suggestion of Wycliffe, who certainly, as we shall soon see, was on good terms with the Crown and the great nobles ; if so, it savoured of that sordid subtlety his character always evinced. If he succeeded, he would not much fear the King's Court. If he failed, he well knew his opponents would be in the meshes of this statute. He did fail ; but they paid dearly for their victory, and a fine of between £2000 and £3000 of our present money was inflicted on them ere they could obtain the benefit of their decree. The biographers of Wycliffe, probably through not being aware of the legal history of the time, actually represent this as a *bribe* to the Crown !

This is a turning point in the history of Wycliffe. Let it be distinctly understood that up to the time of his expulsion from Catherine Hall by the Primate, and his appeal to Rome, he had only appeared as an assailant of the Friars. He had put forth nothing against the Supremacy of the Holy See ; and he had himself recognized it by his appeal. But it is most important to remark that, as to the

* 38 Edw. III. c. 1.

result of that appeal he could have no reasonable doubt. He well knew it *must* be against him ; because the decree by which he had profited, and against the reversal of which he appealed, had expelled all the monks, and the foundation distinctly required that there should be four. It is material to remark this for the reason, that his biographers—knowing that his subsequent error is chiefly attributed to his resentment with respect this matter—seek to get rid of it by representing that he had already appeared as an assailant of the Holy See before the final decree. This is not true : and even if it were, it would not affect the case, since, as we have shown, he could scarcely have expected any decree in his favour. The *fact* is, that anticipating the result which ensued, he eagerly laid hold of an occasion which offered, for the purpose of ingratiating himself with the Crown and the Parliament. The Pope had claimed the arrears of Peter's Pence which had been paid—as we have seen—ever since the Saxon Church was founded, and had been acknowledged even by a monarch so arbitrary as the second Henry. Wycliffe published a tract *against* the claim, which the King and Parliament were equally disinclined to recognize, and which he encouraged them to resist ; and he did so on the miserable ground that it was imposed on the kingdom for the first time by John. The key to his conduct on this occasion, and the clue to his whole history and character, is to be detected in a single sentence in this tract, “*I am the preacher, clerk, and chaplain to the King.*” Yes ; these *royal chaplains*, from Wycliffe to Wolsey, were the bane and ruin of the Church ; men destined to show how impossible it was to “serve God and Mammon ;” to consult sordid self-interest without betraying the Church. It was not in being a faithful child of the Church that Wycliffe gloried, but in being a servant of the Crown.

Nothing is more remarkable in the career of Wycliffe than the court he paid to the Crown, and the care he took to acquire the patronage of princes. Yet that was an age in which the King and the nobility were equally debauched and depraved. The King—who was the son of a shameless adulteress, and her husband's murderer—himself added adultery to cruelty and rapacity ; and even to his old age dallied with concubines. His brothers were like him : John of Gaunt lived for years in adultery with the

wife of a knight;* and his younger brother, Gloucester, was a monster of treachery and cruelty; as he proved in the reign of his nephew, when, by the concurrent testimony of all historians, he played the part at once of traitor and murderer, and showed himself as ruthless a wretch as ever had royal blood in his veins. Yet to these, and men such as these, Wycliffe paid careful and abject court. As to the King we have just seen a specimen of his subserviency. Properly to appreciate it, however, we must remark that Wycliffe still professed to recognize in the Pope "the Vicar of God on earth." Yet to court the favour of his sovereign he came forward with ostentatious alacrity to advocate the withholding of a tribute of gratitude, never until this time denied ever since the establishment of the Anglo-Saxon Church; and he does so under false pretences, and in a strain of insolent sarcasm and truculent contempt. This of course quite suited the king's purpose, and so we can scarcely be surprised to read that "he was against the Pope's clergy; and willingly hearkened unto heretics."[†]

Quite consistent with this was his continual dedication of his calumnious tracts to the adulterous Lancaster and the ferocious Gloucester; and to such a degree of sycophancy does he descend, that he ascribes one of his treatises thus, "To the most worshipful and *gentlest* Lord Gloucester." Pretty princes these, for theological treatises to be inscribed to! But if they were wicked Wycliffe was worldly-minded; and found them useful patrons.

Wycliffe knew his men. He was well aware that to lewd and rapacious men nothing is so pleasing as to hear the "vices" of the clergy and the pride of the prelacy, spoken of with stinging severity. So Wycliffe played loudly on this string. He made himself the mouthpiece of all the envy and enmity which these immoral men felt towards the prelacy and clergy, whose superior abilities and integrity made them preferred for all great civil offices. He was for ever traducing "prelates" and "clerks possessors," (men for whom his patrons entertained very much the feelings of wolves for fat sheep,) reviling them all, without distinction, as proud worldly-minded, and sordid. Here again, as in the case of the friars, we ask, was

* See Froissart, for an account of the scandal this gave.

† Chronicles of Caxton.

this so? Was it not slander? His biographers *shirk* the question; and with sufficient reason, for the least attention to contemporary history shows it was the foulest slander. The age was illustrious for pious and generous churchmen. It was the age of William of Wykeham, whose fame will live while Winchester and Oxford last; and it was an age in which Archbishops, like Sudbury, Courtnay, and Arundel, exhibited along with the most vast abilities, the greatest zeal for religion and education. Here again, then, we convict Wycliffe of wholesale calumny. But his *interests* did not as yet allow of heresy. He soon received his reward. Royal and princely influence at the University—a place where it always was strongest—gained for him the Theological Chair.

Two years after he is selected by the King as one of the commissioners, to uphold his claims against the Holy See with reference to papal presentations. The commission sat at Bruges, where he was brought into personal intercourse with John of Gaunt, who was ambassador there to arrange a treaty with France. In the same year, Wycliffe receives from the *Crown* the prebend of Aust in the collegiate Church of Westbury, in the diocese of Worcester, and subsequently the rectory of Lutterworth in the diocese of Lincoln. And this was the man who unceasingly traduced his own order as “flatterers and parasites of the great,”* encouraging their vices, and full of “covetise.” “The greatest of the Church, follow not Christ but Anti-Christ. Look at the Pope first, and his cardinals; more foul pride and covetise is in no lord. Go we to bishops, then, and rich abbots, fathers of convents; these ask worldly worship,” &c. “Christian men are opposed to bishops,” &c. This was his prevalent style, yet he at the same time wrote as violently against the Friars who held no benefices, and, if they ever broke the rule of their founder, broke it only as to books. The inconsistency, indeed, of Wycliffe is as palpable as the wickedness of his calumny. He wrote against the endowments of the clergy; yet greedily grasped at them. Even his biographers—blinded as they are to the moral depravity of his character—cannot help perceiving the inconsistency. And it is curious to observe how they attempt to apologize for it. “It may perhaps be thought remarkable that any one who main-

* See his “Office of Curates.”

tained such principles should nevertheless have held without apparent scruple, the chair of theology at Oxford, a prebendal stall, and parochial rectory. The value of these preferments must have been considerable; at any rate far beyond the measure of what was needful to supply the moderate necessities of life, at a period when the sacred office doomed its professors to celibacy; and therefore *far beyond what his system would seem to allot as the legitimate provision of a Christian minister.* However he found a different scheme actually established, and doubtless conceived himself at liberty to conform to it." No doubt. Very easy sophistry. But he also conceived himself at liberty coarsely to revile others who conformed to it; although they did not, as he did, affect to object to it. What species of sophistry can vindicate such hypocrisy, and such want of charity? His biographers upon this, as in every other part of his conduct, shirk or skulk over the material points to be considered, and do all they can to conceal its real character. The iniquity of his calumny is aggravated by the fact, that at no period was the munificence and charity of the English prelates more displayed than during the life of their truculent assailant. Even Protestant writers of our own day recognize their virtues. Thus a recent able writer says of Arundel, who was successively Bishop of Ely, Archbishop of York, and Archbishop of Canterbury: "His liberality to the three cathedrals over which he presided shows that a love of money was not one of his vices."^{*} Of Simon de Sudbury, who was Primate, he says: "He was a munificent benefactor to his native town, and expended large sums on his cathedral."[†] Of Stratford, another Primate, there is a similar statement.[‡] Of Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham, we read: "He occupied himself in forming the largest library in Europe, which he bequeathed to Trinity College, Oxford; the first public library founded in that University. His virtues and his charities were equal to his talents and learning. He was most bountiful to the poor," &c.[§] And of Courtney, who was Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, we are told, "He contributed

* Foss's "Lives of the Judges," vol. iv. p. 150.

† Ib. 100.

‡ Ib. vol. iii. p. 522. § Ib. p. 413.

largely to the erection of the nave of the cathedral, and gave it rich presents. He rebuilt Maidstone Church, and restored others, besides other benefactions."^{*} Such were the prelates, all living in the lifetime of Wycliffe, whom he so coarsely assailed. They were the benefactors of their Church and country. And he was their slanderer, in order to ingratiate himself with those princes who were the oppressors and plunderers of both. The object and the effect of this was, that he had their protection against the Church. Wycliffe well knew he should need it; and he cunningly availed himself of any general or personal enmity which might assist him. He had the full benefit of it. In 1377 he was cited by Courtnay, bishop of London, the prelate lastly mentioned among those just referred to. He was aware that, as his biographer informs us, the adulterous Duke of Lancaster "had not only a hatred of ecclesiastical power," (that hatred which all wicked men have for it,) "but a personal aversion to Courtnay, who had shown himself a determined adversary of the Duke in the Parliamentary proceedings of the last year." The reverend writer, who adds, that the bishop was "a churchman of notorious arrogance," had previously "declined to enter into the causes which had engaged the Parliament of 1376, in measures of determined opposition to the administration of John of Gaunt." We know not which is most dishonest here, the *suggestio falsi*, or the *suppressio veri*. As to the arrogance of Courtnay, it is a calumny, which we will refute by Protestant authority. The respectable writer, whose testimony we have before referred to in favour of these illustrious ecclesiastics, says of him, "He was of noble presence and courtly manners, with the learning fit for his position: and what speaks more in his praise, he was a favourite with the monks of his cathedral."[†] His "manners" were severely tested by the patron of Wycliffe, as we shall see; and our readers shall judge on which side was the "arrogance." His opposition to John of Gaunt, and the character of that prince will be alike better appreciated when we remind our readers of the cause of that opposition in which the prelate only acted along with the whole body of Parliament. It was an attempt by the Duke,—a very appropriate attempt—on

* Foss, p. 50.

† Ib. vol. iv. p. 51.

his part, as an adulterer, to rule the King, another adulterer, in a manner ruinous to the welfare of the country, by means of the illicit influence of Alice Perron, the royal concubine, who robbed her paramour on his death-bed.

Such was the prince who patronized Wycliffe, and, "partly from hatred of ecclesiastical power, and partly from personal aversion to Courtnay," made his appearance before that accomplished prelate, with an ostentatious insolence which speedily aroused the ire of the people, who would not see their bishop insulted, and who revenged themselves on the Duke by burning down his house. This speaks volumes, as to the relative estimation in which the prelate and the prince were respectively held by the people. The Duke behaved (with Wycliffe by his side, be it observed) with a coarse violence which even the biographers of Wycliffe cannot defend. He insolently told Wycliffe to be seated, and when the bishop objected to such a violation of all usage, the Duke declared he would "bring down the pride of him and all the prelacy of England;" and taunted the prelate with boasting of his parents, (the Earl and Countess of Devonshire,) whereupon the bishop made an answer, which even Wycliffe's biographer calls "singularly moderate and wise;" and the mingled dignity and humility of which, under such sudden provocation, amply exposes the injustice of the charging him with arrogance. "My confidence is not in my parents nor in man else, but only in God; in whom I trust." The passion of the Duke overcame him we are told, and he was overheard to mutter that he would "drag the bishop out by the hair of his head;" a brutal threat which set the Londoners in a roar; and the trial ended in a riot, amidst which Wycliffe escaped.*

Emboldened by the high patronage he had received, he soon came forward again at the bidding of the princes who ruled England during the minority of Richard II., to assail

* We find from the eighth volume of the *Archæologia*, a deed of the Duke's at this very time, which is extremely significant of his sanguinary character. In 1378, two men who had offended him, took refuge in the Sanctuary of Westminster. He sent thither a party of his myrmidons, who slew them at the high altar, with several others, including a monk. The hatred such a man would bear towards the Church can be appreciated. He and Wycliffe were worthy of each other.

the Pope as Antichrist ; although even at this time he professed to acknowledge him as the " Vicar of God on earth." John of Gaunt and the " Gentle Gloucester " were powerful protectors, and under their auspices Wycliffe hoped to gratify his malignity with impunity, if not to attain further reward. The University, devoted as universities always have been to the secular power, did not seek to restrain him. The Primate and his prelate were slow to assail him. A Bull from the Holy See reproached them with neglect. And in the next year Wycliffe was cited to answer before papal commissioners at Lambeth. The event showed that he had not reckoned wrongly on the power of his patrons. A body of ruffians broke into the hall, and their menaces alarmed the prelates. The biographers of Wycliffe represent this as a sign of popular sympathy. It is scarcely likely that in a few months such a change should have taken place in the mind of the people. And a far more probable account of the matter is, that these ruffians were a hired mob, or retainers of Wycliffe's patrons. This supposition is supported by two pregnant facts. The Mayor and aldermen had, after the riot of last year, been removed, and replaced by creatures of the Duke of Lancaster ; and the Queen Mother sent a messenger to the prelates, forbidding them from proceeding. The old chronicler thus describes the effect upon their minds : " They who had sworn that they would yield no obedience to the princes and nobles of the realm until they had chastised the excesses of the heresiarch conformably to the Papal mandate, were smitten with such terror by the retainers of the princess, that they became as men that hear not, and in whose mouth are no reproofs." * But if the commissioners had no idea of martyrdom, so neither most assuredly had Wycliffe. For he had prepared a paper of explanations, as to which a Protestant Church historian thus speaks : " He delivered to the court a protest and qualification of his positions, which had been deemed erroneous and heretical. One of his conclusions was, that all mankind have no power to ordain that Peter and his successors should rule over the world for ever. His explanation was to this effect : " That it is not in man's power to stop the coming of Christ to judge the quick and dead ; " an explanation which rendered the con-

* Wals. Hist. Angl. p. 205.

clusion equivocal, if not nugatory.* Again, in another article he maintained that "there is no power granted by Christ to His disciples to excommunicate a subject for the denial of temporalities to the clergy," (the word denial in those days had the meaning of *withdrawal*). This is a part of his doctrine which undoubtedly was levelled at the right of the clergy to possess any kind of property, and was intended to be applied to the purpose of setting that right aside. He takes care, however, in his explanations to avoid the direct assertion of his real sentiment, by saying only that this is declared in the doctrinal principle taught in Scripture, according to which we believe that God is to be loved above all things, and our neighbour or enemy above all temporal goods."† Then in another of his conclusions he asserted that it was lawful to take away the temporalities of the Church, by way of medicine to prevent sin, notwithstanding excommunication, because they are not given but under a condition; but then his explanation before the delegates was, "God forbid that by these words occasion should be given to the lords temporal to take away the goods of the Church!" The Protestant historian well might say, "I make no remark on this conclusion or its explanation!"‡ None surely need be made save this, that it is as clear that Wycliffe was a *shuffler* as that he was a slanderer. His biographers assert that he never contemplated a spoliation of the Church by the bare authority and will of individuals, but a deprivation by the authority of the Church; and by the Church he understood, not only the clergy, but the laity,—a doctrine (it is added) "formidably exemplified in the sixteenth century." If any sophistry could have been more egregious than the heretic's, it is apologists'. In another paper he laid before *Parliament*, they admit he was far more explicit. And they are right there. "You are told," he says, "that secular men must not lay hands on the possessions of the clergy, &c. Is impiety like this to be endured?" Truly might his biographers say, "Beyond all doubt, on this and many other occasions he expressed himself in language which may seem almost to justify the charge, that by his system all ecclesiastical possessions were marked

* Milner's Church History, vol. iv. p. 117.

† Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

out for spoliation.* It must be allowed that he taught a lesson to princes, and nobles, and commoners, which they were all abundantly willing to learn, and most zealously in a future age did they 'better the instruction.' " We shall soon see that the "commoners" of his own age "bettered his instruction," and with terrible and disastrous results. But how is it (let us ask) that he put forth different papers, one so "much more *explicit*" than the other? How did it happen that the one so "much more explicit" (i. e. more truculent) was addressed to the *Parliament*? Is it not plain that he was playing an artful and double game, seeking to hoodwink the commissioners on the one hand, and appeal to secular power, by the most sordid temptations, on the other? To the prelates he pretends conformity to their authority; to the Parliament he conciliates support, by shadowing out confiscation of Church property. Could there be more palpable duplicity? The reason of his truculence in the document addressed to Parliament is as much to be found perhaps in time as place. It was *after* the conference. In this document he says, "Whether the delegates, by the Pope's permission, proceed to condemn my conclusion, or the Lord Pope himself, the faithful are unanimously to make opposition to that *blasphemous opinion!*" Once more let us repeat, that he professed even now to regard the Pope as God's Vicar on earth: was this the language of a conscientious Christian or of a conscious rebel?—of a pious confessor or of an audacious impostor? Was he conscious of sincerity or *confident of impunity?* The old chronicler expresses the opinion which prevailed at the time, and which, we suspect, will be confirmed by the reader. "By artful explanatory statements he deluded his judges, and threw some plausible meaning into his nefarious propositions; all of which, if simply taken according to the mode in which he taught them in the schools and in his public preaching, unquestionably savoured of heretical gravity." That Wycliffe acted an artful part is plain from the admitted fact, that his explanations to the delegates, and his manifesto to the Parliament, were very different in their tone. He was playing a double game, and a very safe one. The delegates he sought to mystify by subtle sophistications,

* This is Mr. Hallam's opinion. See his *History of the Middle Ages*. vol. ii. p. 358, 4th Edit.

the parliament to propitiate by apparent boldness. The former would send their account of his examination to the Holy See, whose judgment could be formed thereon; Parliament would receive his bolder declarations, and would be delighted with its anti-papal insolence, not knowing probably very accurately his sophistical qualifications and explanations before the delegates, which, indeed, were rather too perplexing for the lay intellect. His manifesto to the Parliament recites, that the conclusions he had given in to the delegates had been *sent to Rome (ad curiam Romanam transmissæ)*; and when it is borne in mind how much more pleasing to the rebellious laymen the one document is than the other, it is impossible to avoid the obvious inference:

We now come to a matter of much importance for the just appreciation of the events which follow. It will have been observed that Wycliffe's heresy had taken a very *convenient* form. It had chiefly been directed to the upholding of rebellion against the Holy See, and spoliation of Church property. These, as we have seen, were precisely the points on which he was certain of sympathy and support among the most powerful laymen, especially from the sovereign and the princes of the blood. This was the reign in which, partly from the principles he had promulgated, legislation had for the first time in English history, been formally directed against the papal supremacy and church property; and it was an age, also, in which judicial servility stretched to the utmost the claims of the royal prerogative. About this time sat on the bench as Chief Justice one Thorpe, of whom two things are told, strikingly illustrative of the character of men who pandered to the tyranny of the secular power. He once cited from the Bench with savage eagerness, in a case in which the Holy See was concerned, the story we have already quoted, of Edward I. threatening to have a man "drawn and hung" merely for publishing a papal excommunication; although the very case in which he cited it showed, that the poor man had only committed a trifling irregularity; for the archbishop ought to have certified the excommunication; and if he had done so, the law recognized it. But the real reason of the king's wrath was, that he did not want to have the excommunication published at all. It thwarted his will. And his judges were ready to menace any one with hanging, in order to propi-

tiate a tyrant. It was in this very age that bribery was most flagrant amongst them ; and this very Chief Justice Thorpe was disgraced for it.* The one incident explains the other. Men who are servile are sure to be sordid. Those who pander to a tyrant are sure to be venal and wilful ; and the truth is illustrated in Wycliffe as well as in Thorpe. Men of the same age, they were men of the same stamp. Each in his sphere served a tyrant with ready subserviency, one upholding oppression by sanguinary menaces, the other advocating spoliation by subtle sophistries. It was a safe course for himself. The courtiers could not touch *him*. He was their instrument, and he had already experienced their protection. If any one suffered, it would be the prelates, who had impeached him, and his was a temper to which revenge was sweet. Ere long he had it. We have already quoted from his biographer the remarkable confession, that he “taught spoliation of ecclesiastical possessions,—a lesson which princes, nobles, and commoners were willing to learn ;” and that in a *future* age they “bettered his instruction.” In *that* age they did so. We have sufficiently adverted to the oppressions of the Crown and Parliament. But there were others who had learnt the lesson, and read it differently. They could not see any reason why the prelates should be plundered and peers escape. The result was rebellion. Lingard very justly ascribes the popular insurrection of 1381 to the notions of Wycliffe, disseminated by his followers, that the right of property was founded in grace, and that no one who was in sin could be entitled to it.† And Wycliffe’s biographers admit “it is possible that the voice of loud invective against the Church may have assisted to call up from the depths of popular discontent a mad ungovernable spirit of anarchy and rebellion.”‡ It is added, “The charges with which the clergy were assailed, were indeed frequently such as an exasperated populace might easily transfer to tyranny of every description ; and it would be hopeless to deny that the language adopted by Wycliffe or his itinerant preachers, in urging their principles of reformation, did frequently burst through the barriers of sobriety and caution, and was occasionally

* See Foss.

† Ling, vol. iv. 236.

‡ Le Bas, p. 245.

violent enough to compromise the safety of all existing institutions.” This is tolerably decisive as to the tendencies of Wycliffe’s heresies. But as we are anxious to have this matter well understood, these are Wycliffe’s own words. He told the people: “ That all things belong to the just, though they must not presume to enforce their right by any worldly means.”* What was this but preaching communism, and telling men they must not use physical force? For of course all would be apt to consider themselves among the “ just,” and to apply this comfortable and convenient definition of right to themselves. And they would not be likely to draw nice distinctions on a doctrine so grateful to human nature, especially when it was constantly preached to them by ignorant itinerants. For Wycliffe had started an irregular and unauthorized system of itinerant preaching, on the part of ‘poor priests,’ (as he called them) under his influence, who, as we gather from an ordinance of Archbishop Courtnay, in 1382, affected peculiar sanctity of manners, and preached at fairs and markets, and in the churchyards throughout the kingdom. Wycliffe, in fact, made himself a sort of mediæval Wesley, quite as artful, and more mischievous. His biographer himself says, “ It cannot be denied that the words of Wycliffe, in the mouths of many of his more ignorant followers, may have helped to impart something of a revolutionary character to Lollardism,† the name then given to his heresy. That long before the insurrection his itinerant preachers had been at work all over the country, and that they were most malignant incendiaries is quite clear, and that they were like their master, hypocrites and impostors, is equally clear. We read in the contemporary historians of the names of several of them, who were more marked and noted than others; and we find that they were characterized by the same wholesale slander and envenomed invective as their master. We are told of one (Aston) that he always affirmed that he and his fellow “poor priests” were the only true preachers, and that all the rest of the clergy were teachers of falsehood, and of another (Purney), that he assailed with the deadliest detraction all preachers but those of his own sect. They declaimed, as Wycliffe had done, against taking benefices,

* Le Bas, 352.

† Ibid. p. 354.

(he had written a tract, entitled "Why poor priests take not benefices,") and yet we find one after another taking benefices as soon as they could get them; and it is amusing to hear the Primate Arundel thus addressing one of them: "Thou and such other loosels of thy sect would shave your beards full neere for to have a benefice. For I know *none more covetous shrews than ye be when that ye have a benefice.* For lo! I gave to John Purney a benefice (he was one of Wycliffe's men), and I heard more complaints about his covetousness for tithes and other misdoings than I did of all the men that were advanced in my diocese." Hereford, Aston, and others greedily accepted benefices. A more particular account of one of these worthies will help our readers to understand the insurrection. We will give it in the words of Wycliffe's biographer, Le Bas: "William Swinderby was another of these preachers. He is represented by Knighton as a man of unsettled habits and inconstant temper. He first signalized himself at Leicester, by a rash assault upon the pride of women. His ungracious freedom of speech excited the wrath of all the females in the place to such a degree, that they were ready to stone him out of the town. He next attacked the merchants, and nearly drove them to despair, by declaring that no rich man could enter the kingdom of heaven. He then for a time became a recluse. Growing weary of total seclusion, he was taken into an abbey, but his fondness for itinerancy soon returned, and forced him once more to a conflict with the corruptions of the world, in company with one Smith, a blacksmith. His denunciations were now levelled against the enormities of the Church, a theme which was sure to find him an abundance of willing hearers. When Bokyngham, Bishop of Lincoln, endeavoured to restrain him, he made a pulpit of two millstones in the high street of that city, from which he proclaimed, that in spite of the Pope's teeth he could and would preach in the highway, so long as he had the good will of the people. He was compelled to abjure his conclusions; and being deeply impressed with the disgrace of his recantation, he fled to Coventry, resumed his former habits, and was recovering his popularity, when he was expelled by the diocesan with shame and contempt."* This specimen will suffice. Truly may the reverend writer add, "It

* Le Bas, p. 380.

must be acknowledged that the picture here presented to us of a poor travelling priest is very far from honourable to that class of agitators. It exhibits a combination of rashness and inconstancy which might have reflected discredit on the very best of causes." Probably our readers will think that "the best of causes" was not likely to have such defenders. It is appropriate to the cause of heresy, to have "travelling agitators." And if the tree may be known by its fruit, there will be small question as to the character of the tree in this instance. The fruits were rebellion, spoliation, and slaughter; to which the people were incited by the inflammatory teaching of these travelling agitators. The old chroniclers say, that Wycliffe's followers were numerous and truculent; and that "their maxim was, that if any one will not hear you, take the sword and strike him, or wound him with a *backbiting tongue*."* How the master followed the latter part of the precept has been seen. His biographer observes, "It is amusing to find the Romish historian ascribing to the Lollards the very maxims which were notoriously in the mouth of the most zealous and ignorant Papists. Every one will remember the advice of St. Lewis to all good and unlearned Catholics: 'Never argue with a heretic. If any such should presume to assail your faith, make him no other reply but to draw your sword from its scabbard.'" No reference is given to this striking dictum, and we may question its authority; but it is strange that the reverend writer did not perceive it is, so far from being *apposite*, precisely the *opposite* case to that of the Wycliffites. They were not the defenders of their own faith, but *assailers of other men's*. And really, considering their conduct, we should say, they met with the reception deserved. We need not do more than allude to the atrocities perpetrated by the rebels; of which the most shocking was the murder of the Primate Sudbury, the prelate who had directed the citation of Wycliffe. It is very remarkable that one of the leaders of the rebels appears to have been a Wycliffite. We refer to Ball, who at all events adopted Wycliffe's tenets and preached them.† Even Wycliffe's biographers cannot deny that "the opinions scattered by this fanatic had some resemblance to those of Wycliffe and his fol-

* Knighton, 2662.

† Walsingham, 275, cited by Lingard, vol. iv. 238.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. LXX.

lowers."* It is further observable that Jack Straw confessed the object of the rebels was to exterminate all "clerks' possessurers," the very term used by Wycliffe in his earlier writings against the clergy. He had abandoned their doctrines, since he had added preferment to preferment; but his lay disciples had not abandoned them and "bettered the instruction."

It is most instructive to observe such an obvious connection between this sanguinary rebellion and that conceited spirit in which the most ignorant under the auspices of Wycliffe and his travelling preachers applied their "private judgment" to the interpretation of the Scriptures. Of the worst of these incendiaries, such as Swinderby, we read, that they filled their discourses or writings with quotations from Scripture, we need scarcely say egregiously misapplied. Just as we have seen in our own days Mormonism vindicated on "private interpretation" of the Sacred Scriptures, so was it with Lollardism; so has it ever been with fanaticism in every age. The Bible, or rather presumptuous and impious perversion of it, has been its citadel and strength. Wycliffe was well aware of its capability of such perversion; and to supply his disciples with their mischievous warfare, set about circulating it in the vulgar tongue. Such portions of Scripture as were most open to this species of adaptation he was most desirous should be known to the people, separated from the salutary teaching of the Church. Just as the Puritans in an after age, so their precursors the Lollards in this, found in these parts of the Bible an arsenal and armoury of texts they could pervert into a defence for their atrocities and impieties. This is the real truth as to that vaunted work of Wycliffe, which is made a topic of so much exultation by his biographers, his "complete translation of the Bible." The Bible had been in the Latin ever since the time of Jerome; and as Sir J. More said truly enough, the whole Bible had been, long before Wycliffe's day, by virtuous and well learned men translated into the English tongue, and by *good and godly* people with *devotion and soberness, well and reverently* read." Although even Lingard falls into the error of stating that Wycliffe "made a new translation," it is clear from the context that what he means is, rather that he put forth and published to the

* Le Bas, 395.

vulgar in a complete form the translations already made. "There was another weapon (he says) which the Rector of Lutterworth wielded with efficacy and address. In proof of his doctrines he appealed to the Scriptures, *and thus made his disciples judges between him and the bishops.* Several versions of the Sacred writings were even then extant, but they were confined to libraries, or only in the hands of persons who aspired to superior sanctity. Wycliffe made a new translation, multiplied the copies with the aid of transcribers, and by his poor priests recommended it to the perusal of their hearers." That is to say, he made complete copies of the Scriptures, founded on existing translations, very likely to some extent perverted, as the Protestant version of the time of James I. ; but it is clear that it is utterly false to ascribe to him the great work of having first translated the Bible into English. What he did was to thrust it into the hands of the ignorant, and to diffuse among them a bad and proud spirit, by which they were led to pervert and misapply it ; so that whereas, in the words of Sir T. More, it had previously been by good and godly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read,—it was now under his auspices, by bad and ungodly people, without devotion or sobriety, ill and irreverently read, and therefore most lamentably misinterpreted and abused. Witness, for instance, Swinderby and Ball, with their quotations of Scripture and their truculent fanaticism, resembling that of the puritans at a later age. It is very amusing to observe how Wycliffe's biographers unconsciously exhibit this. "The Wycliffites had in their possession more powerful reasons than those of brawling and bloodshed. They had the English Bible in their hands or in their memories. Here lay the grand secret of their strength. Both men and women, as Knighton informs us, commenced teachers of the Gospel in their mother tongue." Yes: and what was the use they made of it ? The fatal fruits of its perversion we have seen. On the confession of Wycliffe's biographers, the teachings of these fanatics tended to inflame the people into rebellion, and thus led to "brawling and bloodshed." Marvellous the infatuation which leads even intelligent men still to cling to the Protestant theory of indiscriminate and undisciplined Bible-reading and unauthorized interpretation, of which Wycliffe was our earliest effective exponent ! This, how-

ever, is made the chief corner-stone of his fame ; and an expensive edition of his version of the Bible has recently been published under distinguished auspices, as a monument to his merit ! Yet, even while we write, this mistaken system is leading myriads into fatal and fearful error, and even the abominations of the Agapemone or of Mormonism are vindicated by the reading of the Bible. The experience of the present age in this respect only attests the teaching of the past. The *Agapemone* issues from the same source as the Anabaptists or the Albigenenses, and the Mormonites are of the same school as the Lollards or Wycliffites. They all "read their Bibles." The history of Wycliffe exposes his own heresy ; his teaching was condemned by its fruits ; yet prejudice is too powerful even for experience ; and enlightened Protestants continue to maintain the soundness of those conclusions, which, even in the opinion of his own patrons, led to sedition and rebellion.

We have already alluded to another ally of Wycliffe's—the Poet Chaucer. We have said that it is not only our own idea that they were fellow-labourers in the same unhallowed object of heaping obloquy on the clergy, especially the friars. The coincidences in their writings cannot be accidental. Wycliffe writes treatises against " friars and pardoners," and Chaucer introduces a friar and a pardoner into his *Canterbury Tales*, in the most obscene and odious way. Wycliffe writes thus : " When there cometh a pardoner to rich places, with stolen bulls and false relics, granting more years of pardon than come before Domesday, for gaining worldly wealth, he shall be revered of curates—to have a great part of that which he getteth." And in Chaucer's description of the pardoner is a perfectly parallel passage :

" But with these relics when he found,
A poor parson dwelling in upland,
Upon a day he got him more money
Than that parson got in months tway."

It will be remembered that Wycliffe called his itinerant agitators " poor priests," and the above is not the only passage in Chaucer, in which there appears some allusion to them. His description of the parson strikes the biographer of Wycliffe as if drawn upon the model of him and his " poor priests."

“A good man there was of religion,
 He was a *poor parson* of a town,
 But rich he was of holy thought and work,
 He was a *learned* man also, a clerk ;
 That *Christ's Gospel* truly would preach,
 Benign he was and wondrous diligent,
 And in *adversity full patient*.”

It is very remarkable that Chaucer's most learned editors are of opinion that this was written in or about the year 1383,* which would be about the time when Wycliffe was cited by the Primate ; and the last line really looks like an allusion to that event in his career, as most undoubtedly another line looks like a friendly description of his character.

“But if he knew any person obstinate,
 Whether he were of high or low estate,
 Him would he reprove sharply for the nonce.”

It is evidently friendly : and palpably untrue, if designed for Wycliffe, for he is never caught “reproving” any “of high estate,” except indeed *prelates*. He had no word of reproof for the adulterous and rapacious princes who were his patrons. He to their views was “wondrous kind.” It was only the faults of friars, priests, and prelates, he felt called upon to publish and proclaim. We have seen that his “poor priests” followed his example in drawing the most invidious contrasts between themselves and the rest of the clergy. And Chaucer writes just in the same strain.

“A friar there was, a wanton and a merry,”

—is the way in which he opens his description of the frere,” and he winds up thus :

“For there he was not like a cloisterer,
 With thread-bare cope—as is a *poor scholar*.”

The contemporary writers inform us that Wycliffe and his “poor priests” affected an air of poverty by wearing thread-bare raiment. The contrast is drawn as strongly between the monk :

—“a lord full fat and in good point,”

* Tyrwhitt's Chaucer, Introduction, p. 2.

and the “poor clerk,” who is represented as of *Oxford*, be it observed [Wycliffe’s university],

“A clerk there was Oxenforde also,
That mild logic hadde long ago,
And he was not right fat, I undertake,
But looked holye and right soberlye.
Full *thredabare* was his merest courtesy,
For he had *goten him yet no benefice*,
Ne was nought worldly to have an office.”

The reader will remember Wycliffe’s treatise, “Why poor priests have no benefices;” which he ascribes to their conscientiousness, and contrasts their scrupulousness with the worldliness of the clergy in general. The reader will also remember that both he and his “poor clerks” swallowed their scruples and took benefices,—as soon as they could get them. This is not the only trait of hypocrisy in which the Poet of Lollardism resembled its preachers. Wycliffe, like the Puritans, of whom he and his “poor priests” were precursors, was very much horrified at the common use in conversation of expressions which they designated as “swearing,”—“swearing by the heart, and nails, and bones, and other members of Christ.” And Chaucer’s “poor Parson,” who instead of telling a story preaches a terribly long sermon, just as one of the “poor priests” would have done, says, “they seemed to glory in swearing great oaths.” Alongside of this pharisaical denunciation we have stories of such gross indecency as would make a harlot blush. There is nothing equal to this except in Burns, the poet of *moral* Scotland, with his “Cottage Bible” on one page, and his “Amang the rigs o’ barley” on the next. In both cases we see the hypocrisy of pharisaical puritanism straining at the gnat and swallowing the camel. So with Wycliffe; scandalized at swearing, and reckless in slander, as cruel as it was coarse, and as wilful as it was cruel. Let us give a specimen, in which there will be another striking correspondence between Wycliffe and Chaucer, between the poet and the preacher. The subject of the sermon of Chaucer’s “poor parson” is Penance, and its tone is, as Wycliffe’s writings on the same subject, exceedingly Jansenistical; saying a great deal of contrition, and very little of the *sacrament*. So in one of Wycliffe’s invectives, he asserted that “the friars say nothing of contrition;” a falsehood as flagrant as

it is malignant. Then Chaucer, in his portrait of the friar, writes in this strain :

"He was an easy man to give penance,
There as he wiste to have a good pitance.
For such a *poor order* for to give
Is signe that a man is well yshrive ;
Full sweetly herde he confession,
And pleasant was his absolution."

There are innumerable other resemblances, showing the strongest sympathy between the poet and the preacher. To give only one more instance. Wycliffe speaks of an abbot and a friar "riding with fourscore horse, with harness of silver and gold ;" and Chaucer thus represents the "monk :"—

"A manly man to been an abbot able,
Full manie a dainty horse had he in stable :
And when he rode men mighte his bridle here,
Gingling in the whistling wind as clere,
And eke as loud as dothe the chapel bell!"

It is not necessary to labour this point more, because Wycliffe's biographers not merely admit, but allege, the connection between his preaching and Chaucer's poetry. Their history shows the same sort of career. Both were flatterers of the Court. Chaucer received pensions and places from Edward III., as Wycliffe received benefices and preferments. The king used them both as his envoys, and both were patronized and protected by the Duke of Lancaster. Chaucer was indeed married to the sister of the Duke's mistress, whom he afterwards wedded. It is to be added, that as Wycliffe's "poor priests" had a close connection with the rebellion of Ball and his brother rioters, so Chaucer and his patron Lancaster were mixed up with the insurrection of John of Nottingham.*

Why have we been so particular about Chaucer? For this reason. The biographer of Wycliffe professes a (somewhat convenient) difficulty in depicting his personal character. "To us he appears almost as a solitary being. He stands before us as a sort of mysterious loneliness. To group him, so to speak, with other living men, would require a very strong effort of the imagination." We

* Tyrwhitt's Chaucer, Appendix to Preface, p. xi.

desire to remove this difficulty, and supply the deficiency. To us, indeed, there has been no difficulty at all in “grouping him with other living men;” and we presume his biographers would admit, indeed their language appears to imply, that this would be some assistance in extenuating his character. *Nosciter e sociis* is a maxim they will not impeach. And hence we have considered his association with Chaucer so material. His patrons and supporters, his followers and admirers, are before us. An adulterous and capricious monarch, lewd and truculent princes, an indecent poet, and unbridled fanatics—such are the “living men” with whom he is “grouped;” and the general idea thus given of his character is tolerably clear, and is amply illustrated and strengthened by the incidents of his own conduct and the events of his own career. His history is a history of self-interest. The palpable purpose and plain result of all his words, works, and acts was, personal advancement; and this was his sole motive, save the gratification of pharisaical pride and malignant revenge. Not more murderous, and not half so malignant, were the mob who slaughtered the Primate Sudbury, incited to their bloody rebellion by the inflammatory teaching of his itinerant incendiaries, than the arch-heretic, who with unceasing enmity “wounded him with backbiting tongue.”

It is infinitely offensive to read the fulsome and affected eulogies which the biographers heap upon the character of so palpable a hypocrite. We are told that “he was as admirable for his personal piety as for his opposition to Romish abuse; that the demolition of error and of fraud was not more constantly present to his mind than the building up of holy principles and affections.” It is curious at the same time to see a sort of suspicion just insinuating itself into the writer’s mind, that this would be too strong for any one who had the slightest insight into the real character of the hero, for it is added, “His memory has been left open to the suggestion, that he is to be honoured as the antagonist of Popery, not as the advocate of Christ; fitter to *join with politicians and with princes* in their resistance to encroachment, than to band with saints and confessors in bearing testimony to the truth as it is in Jesus.” Even where there happened to be some grain of truth in what he said, (and of course, as the devil himself can speak truth when it suits his purpose, albeit he is the father of lies, a heretic may, amidst his indiscriminate

denunciations, hit *some* abuse and assail *some* one who deserves it,) the tone in which he speaks is the reverse of that which any *saintly* censor would assume ; and the spirit he betrays is one of envy and jealousy and animosity, rather than of Christian charity. If he rails at the friars, he is sure to let out that he envies them the popular reverence they receive, and if he abuses worldly-minded priests, he evinces continually that he is jealous of their benefices. Many passages could be cited in confirmation of this. And the eagerness with which he pursued the patronage he affected to despise, and to grasp at preferment he pretended to eschew, complete the portrait of hypocrisy and avidity which his biographers would fain impose upon us as one of sanctity and purity.

The extreme avarice of Wycliffe is exemplified in a manner which would be amusing if it were not disgusting. In writing upon the sacrament of *Orders*, (for he expressly recognises it as such,) he actually contrives to link with a subject so sacred one so secular and sordid, as some petty pecuniary fees or gratuities which were customarily paid on occasions of ordinations. "There is one of these enormities" (says his biographer Le Bas, and even he seems half ashamed and half amused by it) "which seems more especially to move his virtuous indignation. The authorized officiating barber was usually so unconscionable in his demands for executing the clerical tonsure, that he complains a man might be shaved and clipped for a whole year for the same sum that was received by the official artist on this occasion. This, he says, is a foul extortion." Possibly the fee might have been excessive ; fees usually are disproportionate to the service done ; but fancy a man writing on such a subject, *condescending* to such a paltry topic ! Surely his heart must have been marvellously fixed on money, which could have made room for it when engaged on so divine a theme. A saint might have spoken to his Bishop about it, for the sake of others ; but he could hardly have written public reproaches about it,—most certainly could not have railed upon it in a treatise on the *Sacraments* ! So, on whatever subject he speaks, he is sure to come down to a matter of mere money. If railing at indulgences, he enlarges on the sums received for them, and dwells with more energy on the fee charged for the instrument than upon the alleged perversion of doctrine involved. Indeed, it is pretty plain that this is the

argument mostly relied upon, and the objection chiefly urged,—that they *cost* people a little. Here we see the sour and sordid spirit of Puritanism. All along, in the struggles against the See of Rome, it is palpable that the saving of money was the real object.

This was the argument always put forward by the servile flatterers of royalty, who sought its patronage by assailing the papacy ; and it is openly and formally alleged by the legislature in many a solemn statute from the days of Edward III. to those of Henry VIII., as the reason for resisting the supremacy of the Holy See. It is a melancholy confession to make, but it forces itself upon the mind in reading the history of these periods that, but for this spirit of mammon, but for this “love of money, which is the root of all evil,” the supremacy of the Holy See would never have been crushed in this country. So at the Reformation ; it is manifest that those portions of the faith were struck off which it was necessary to get rid of in order to *make money* ; as the worship of the saints, (whose shrines were rich enough to tempt cupidity), the Divine dogma of the Blessed Sacrament (the denial of which made jewelled pixes and golden tabernacles a prey), and so of prayers for the dead, the abolition of which enabled the Crown to confiscate chantries as “superstitious.” And while on the one hand many doctrines were got rid of which stood in the way of spoliation, so on the other hand it is observable that those alone were retained which gave ground for *fees*. Thus as confession and communion were accompanied by no pecuniary payments, the one was virtually abolished, and the other practically done away with ; for even with the *clergy* in the Church of England, *monthly* or *quarterly* communions were the ordinary rule till within the last ten or twenty years ;* but baptisms or *churchings*, for which fees are received, have been religiously retained by the established clergy. The spirit of heresy in England has always been essentially sordid, and in Wycliffe it found a most appropriate impersonation.

The schism in the Papacy which occurred about this period, raised a confusion in Christendom, under cover of which Wycliffe, as his biographer remarks, escaped for some time ; and, emboldened by the impunity which circumstances seemed to ensure him, and anxious to seize

* See Archd. Wilberforce's work on the Incarnation.

the opportunity for ingratiating himself further with his royal and powerful patrons, he put forth a treatise, inciting them to avail themselves of the occasion, with a view of shaking the Papal supremacy. "Trust we in the help of the Lord," he writes, "for He hath cloven the head of Antichrist, and made the two parts fight against each other." About the same time he published a Treatise on the Truth and Meaning of Scripture, one of the most copious of his works, and the most replete with heresy. His audacity rose with his sense of security; and he who up to this time had only assailed the Papal supremacy, or the infallibility of the Church, now assaulted the most sacred mystery of the Catholic faith. In 1381 he publicly, from the Theological Chair of Oxford, impugned the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist. He had overstepped his mark. His fury had carried him too fast and too far. He had miscalculated his prospect of support. The University, unfaithful to the Holy See, was yet not prepared to trifle with the Sacraments. The princes who were pleased to hear the Pope and prelates abused, were not willing to surrender their faith. And Wycliffe found he had made a fatal error. The Chancellor of Oxford summoned an assembly; the treachery of Wycliffe was condemned, and a sentence of suspension was denounced against any who should uphold it. Wycliffe appealed to the king, but it would not avail him. Even Lancaster his patron forbade him to persist in his heresy, and his *tongue* at least was silenced. His *pen*, however, persisted in publishing the most awful impieties against the adorable Sacrament. Next year Courtnay, who had succeeded Sudbury in the Primacy, summoned a Synod, which condemned many of Wycliffe's conclusions as heretical. The course he now took quite corresponded with his whole conduct and conclusion as to his true character. He presented an appeal to Parliament, in which he brought out prominently those points which would be favourably received there, as to the lawfulness of spoiling the clergy, the superiority of the secular power over the ecclesiastical, and so forth, but kept carefully out of view, veiled in vague generalities or subtle sophistries, parts of his teaching which he now knew would, if openly avowed, excite horror rather than sympathy. For example, as to religious orders, which he had before denounced, he now merely contended that it was impossible "that any rule of religious life could be

laid down more perfect than that which is delivered to us by Christ and His Apostles ;" as if any one ever pretended that there could ; and as if the religious orders did anything else than carry out these precepts of perfection. Then as to the Eucharist ; his biographers characteristically remark, that he " abstained from all *diffuseness* of argument," which means, that he entirely concealed and suppressed his heresy, for he contented himself with desiring that Christ's teaching of the Sacrament may be taught, the *contrary teaching*" (i. e., contrary to Christ's) *being brought up by cursed hypocrites and heretics* ;" which was of course true enough, and might have been said of himself. Courtnay the Primate could have said nothing more explicit. All his art, however, availed him not. Parliament had recently had a taste of the Wycliffites, which they were not likely soon to forget. These fanatics had spread bloodshed over the land, and shed some of its best, and purest, and bravest blood. The old chroniclers conceived that this was a judgment for the impunity which had been permitted to Wycliffe, and dwelt upon the circumstance, that it occurred in the octave of the Feast of Corpus Christi. The Primate and prelates were resolved to suffer no longer the arch-heretic to spread his pernicious impieties. Even the University now was aroused to a sense of what was due to the Catholic faith. And Lancaster *withdrew his protection*. The result showed, what we have already pointed out, that upon this protection Wycliffe had all along relied. The moment it was withdrawn he altered his course altogether. When arraigned before Convocation, he did not indeed explicitly retract or recant ; he took a far less direct and creditable course. He prevaricated. He shifted. He shuffled. He sought to *wriggle* out of his heresy in the most unworthy way. As Knighton says, " He instantly laid aside his audacious bearing, put on the breast-plate of dotage, attempted to disclaim his extravagant and fantastic errors, and protested that the follies he was called upon to answer for were basely and falsely ascribed to him by the malicious ingenuity of his enemies." And even his biographer says, " he plunges into a perfect *jungle* of argumentation... and buried himself in the labyrinth of scholastic metaphysics." He resorted to his old trick of having two confessions, one in English and the other in Latin, differing from each other, and, as his biographer

says, the Latin one very much more defective in simplicity. In plain English, he shuffled out of his heresy, without the courage to maintain it, without the honesty to recant it. And so the Convocation were content with depriving him of his Theological Chair, and banishing him from the University. And so he went—in peace but in disgrace—to his Rectory at Lutterworth. There he lived two years longer, discharging the ordinary functions of a parish priest. And now it is that the hypocrisy and depravity of his character betrayed itself in a manner which seems to have escaped the observation of his biographers. He had written outrageously against the Sacraments of the Eucharist and of Penance. Yet he must have continued during all this time administering both those Sacraments, week after week, and offering the Holy and Adorable Sacrifice, the essence of which, as all theologians teach, and as Protestant controversialists plainly perceive and acknowledge, consists in the great dogma of Transubstantiation, which he had so impiously assailed. Now it is undeniable that he had not fully and frankly retracted or recanted his heresies on these subjects; and whether he retained them or not, his conduct in this regard is utterly irreconcileable with honesty. If he believed in those Sacraments, he was dishonest for not fairly retracting his heresies. If he did *not* believe in them, (that is, in the Catholic faith concerning them,) what language is adequate to express his depravity in continuing to offer the Adorable Sacrifice, to say nothing of administering the Sacrament of Penance, or preparing his flock for the Sacrament of Confirmation, of which he speaks in such a strain, that his biographer breaks out thus: “It is scarcely possible to listen to this almost fanatical extravagance without astonishment and even disgust.” Or again, as to his denial of the order of bishops, as to which his biographer says very truly, he might have learnt from St. Austin, that the first person who confounded bishops with priests was adjudged a heretic for that opinion. It follows from these observations, that Wycliffe is deemed to have been a heretic on more than one subject even by his biographer,—that is to say, his episcopal biographer, M. Le Bas. Of course his nonconformist admirer, Dr. Vaughan, is of a different opinion. But we presume both these gentlemen, although they have very cloudy conceptions as to heresy, have some ideas in common as to mora-

lity, and that they take honesty to be a virtue and hypocrisy a vice. And if so, we invite them to consider whether it were honesty or hypocrisy which led Wycliffe to administer sacraments in which he disbelieved, or to affect to disbelieve in doctrines which he believed to be divine, (for one of these things he must have done), and to attest in the most solemn act of divine worship, his faith in a doctrine so tremendous as that of transubstantiation, which, according to their theory, he sincerely believed to be an imposition! Whether he believed or disbelieved, the dilemma is not to be evaded, and the alternative on either side is terrible. The Sacrifice of the Mass could not be sincerely offered but by a believer in transubstantiation. Wycliffe had blasphemed that doctrine. His biographers declare he never had recanted his heresy. Yet he continued for years to offer up that Sacrifice! It is appalling to think of the sacrilegious iniquity, the awful profanity of the act! This is a view of the conduct of Wycliffe we have never seen taken, and it throws a bright but blasting light upon his character. Why did he commit this iniquity and practise this profanity? He could not have believed in the Adorable Sacrifice, or he must have blasphemed what he believed;—which alternative is most awful? Wycliffe's biographers say that the two years he passed in compulsory retirement at Lutterworth were the most austere of his life; and that he published fourteen or fifteen treatises, several of them among the most important of his writings. They do not seem to have been aware of the full force of this fact. If he were so very active, if his writings were so very numerous during this period, how does it happen that in none of them does he repeat any of those heretical opinions for which he had been banished from Oxford? It could only have been from one of two motives,—conviction of their falsity, or want of courage to maintain them. His biographers do not entertain any idea that the former was the reason. Then it is clear it must have been the latter. But what was it of which Wycliffe was afraid? His biographers represent that he did not at all retract or recant. If so, then he must have been liable to the punishment of burning. They do not conceal this; and they would have it that the prelates were only deterred from inflicting the punishment by their apprehensions of his powerful protectors. Be that as it may, it is alleged he did not retract, and yet he escaped cor-

poral punishment. Then it could not have been solely fear on that score which prevented him from maintaining his condemned opinions. What *other* fear could have influenced him? There was only one,—the fear of *losing his living*. His life, his liberty, and his living, these were all the prelates could have taken from him. His biographers represent, probably truly, that the two former were safe, by reason of his patrons' influence. Then it must have been fear as to the *last* alone which kept him silent on the condemned subjects. Fear as to his *living*! So it seems, on the showing of his own biographers and admirers, he was but a sorry, shabby, sordid sort of heretic after all. And as hypocritical as sordid. For he had always represented himself as peculiarly indifferent to worldly wealth, and even to have scruples against accepting livings. Yet now, the relinquishment of his living is the sole inducement to his silence on subjects, he had for years pretended to believe, of eternal verity. At all events, it must have been fears for his personal safety that kept him silent. For his biographers themselves stoutly maintain that he never relinquished his heresies! It follows that it is conclusively true, on their own showing, that he was a hypocrite. The works he published during this interval of two years contained nothing *heretical*, nothing upon which he could have been again arraigned, and deprived of his living. It is true they were scurrilous and slanderous enough. Like his father the devil, he “was a liar from the beginning.” His slanders were all the more virulent and bitter, his invectives all the more envenomed, but aimed at characters, not creeds, and at classes of men, not forms of belief; and those classes of men were the prelates and priests, for maligning whom he well knew his wicked and debauched patrons would never think the worse of him. He reviled the “proud priest of Rome” in language viler than ever; but his biographers take care to impress upon us that *this* was no offence to them. In short, he persisted in the only thing which put him in no danger, that is, *slander*. He from the first was a railer, and so he continued to the last. He “spoke evil of dignities” down to his last moments, and uttered slander with his latest breath. This we concede to his admirers; he was consistent—in iniquity. But he concealed his *heresy*, and pocketed the emoluments of his living. Heresy, he had found, would not pay. It exposed him to risk. So he returned like a prudent trader

to his first and safest speculation, and gratified his revenge while he consulted his prudence, by rabid and virulent abuse. For *that* he was sure of not being molested.

But during all this time he *contrived to offer Mass*. This could only have been for the sake of receiving the emoluments of his benefice. This is perfectly consistent with all that had occurred in his past career. Whether as a slanderer or blasphemer, he had always been essentially *sordid*. He had always a plain palpable mercenary *motive* for his sin. He was the worst of all slanderers,—a *sordid* slanderer; the vilest of all blasphemers,—a *sordid* blasphemer. He had plunged into all his heresies with a view to self-interest, and when they ceased to be profitable, he ceased to maintain them. And the mysteries he scorned and contemned he continued to celebrate,—for the sake of *money*. And this was he who had reviled his fellow-clergy for hypocrisy and ‘covetise’! Truly, such a career of sin, crowned with such a climax of crime, might be supposed to merit some exemplary exhibition of Divine vengeance. And it was so. Surely never were the signs of Divine vengeance more visible than in the case of this most mercenary and malignant of heretics. At the very time when he was assuming to offer up the Adorable Sacrifice—at the very moment when he impiously elevated the Sacred Oblation, the Divinity of which he denied, and hypocritically bent his knee in feigned adoration of that ever-adorable Sacrament which he blasphemed,—the hand of God smote him; the visible vengeance of the Almighty crushed and blasted him. The feelings with which Wycliffe’s death was contemplated by his contemporaries is evinced in the narration of it by the old chronicler: “On the day of St. Thomas the Martyr, that organ of the devil,—that enemy of the Church,—that confusion of the populace,—that idol of heretics,—that mirror of hypocrisy,—that instigator of schism,—that sower of hatred,—that fabricator of lies”—(it will be observed how accurately these epithets accord with the description we have drawn of his character and conduct, from the accounts of his own acts afforded by his own admirers,) “when on the same day, as it is reported, he would have vomited forth the blasphemies which he had prepared in his sermon against St. Thomas, being suddenly struck by the judgment of God, felt all his limbs invaded by the palsy. That mouth, which had spoken monstrous things against God and His Saints, or the Holy

Church, was then miserably distorted, exhibiting a frightful spectacle to the beholders. His tongue, now speechless, denied him even the power of confessing. His head shook, and thus plainly showed that the curse which God had thundered forth against Cain was now fallen upon him; and that none might doubt of his being consigned to the company of Cain, he showed by manifest outward signs, that he died in despair.”* His biographer, Mr. Le Bas, calls this “stupid and barbarous jargon.” It seems to us, however, a very striking narrative, with internal evidences of verity, and moreover no attempt is made to impeach its truthfulness, the probability of its truth being surely amply sustained by all the previous facts of the history of this wretched heretic. Enough of him, however; and now a few words as to his miserable and misguided followers.

The history of his heresy extends to the era of the Reformation. In his lifetime, we have seen, the tendencies of his opinions was sufficiently seen by their ebullition into rebellion under the influence, in no small measure, of those itinerant agitators, his poor priests. And how blameable the ecclesiastical authorities had been in not more promptly repressing his heresy, is apparent from the impression which prevailed, that this rebellion was a national retribution for the countenance given to their heresies, and that the murder of the Primate Sudbury was a personal punishment for supineness in neglecting to suppress them. That the Holy See considered there had been culpable neglect, is clear from the language of the Bull directing Wycliffe’s citation, which laments in a tone of severe reprobation that heresies broached at Oxford should have been first detected and denounced at Rome. That the toleration of Wycliffe had proceeded from unworthy motives is as clear as that it met with merited and exemplary retribution. Wycliffe’s earlier slanders, we have seen, were tolerated from the jealousy of the friars. His later heresies, however, were allowed to pass for some time without censure, and then to escape with comparative impunity, from regard for his powerful patrons and protectors. The melancholy results of this unworthy tepidity were soon manifest. Scarcely had the heretic died than his disciples the Lollards proceeded with such audacity and violence,

* Walsingham, 388.

that the king had to be recalled from Ireland to repress them. And in the following reign they actually broke out into rebellion under the auspices of Sir J. Oldcastle, afterwards Lord Cobham. Of course this is an awkward part of our history for the apologists of heresy ; and accordingly it is curious to observe Protestant historians deal with it. When Hume wrote, the close connection between Lollardism and Puritanism, and between Puritanism and Anglicanism, and the substantial identity of Protestantism in every age had not been so well understood ; therefore the facts are pretty truly stated, that the adherents of Lord Cobham, under his direct influence, actually appeared in arms against their Sovereign, and were taken with arms in their hands. In our own times, however, it has been seen that an advocate of Protestantism must defend Lollardism, or at least disguise it ; so Turner has the temerity to say that it is all "rumour," and that there is no evidence of any rebellion at all.* And the biographers of Wycliffe, not daring to take this bold course of denial, shuffle over the facts with disingenuous suppression. "The result, however, was, that the prisons of London were filled ; that nine-and-thirty persons were executed ; and that a vindictive statute was passed against Lollards." It is a curious instance of the dishonesty of Protestant writers, that Mr. Le Bas, while reproaching Lingard with not mentioning Cobham's execution, forbears to mention his rising in rebellion ! Yet the language he uses shows his consciousness of the truth. "The clergy had considerable grounds of complaint. The abuse heaped upon them by the Lollards was not only furious but indiscriminate ; and the Reformers would have suffered little to remain untouched if they had been left entirely to their own impulses. Cathedrals, abbeys, and monasteries might have fallen before them, and all endowments might have been swept away. In addition to this, it can scarcely be denied, that the whole fabric of society was in some hazard from their principles. There is reason to believe, that by many of them the reign of the saints on earth was eagerly anticipated, and that their impatience, if not effectively curbed, might have broken out into wild and fearful commotion."† Let it be remarked, that Wycliffe had com-

* Turner's history, p. 3, c. vii. p. 308,

† Le Bas, 413.

menced his mischievous career by prophesying (this was in 1394,) that the close of the century would bring the end of the world and the Bible-reign of the saints. This circumstance at once shows the dangerous character of the delusion which prevailed, and his direct responsibility for it. It is a wonderful illustration of the blindness of prejudice, that the reverend writer, who could not but make these ample admissions, should go on to contend that the attempts to suppress Lollardism showed a spirit of persecution. The statute of Henry V. recites, "that great rumours, congregations, and insurrections had been raised in the realm by those who belonged to the sect of Lollardie, with a view to subvert the Christian faith, and destroy all the estates of the realm, spiritual and temporal, and all the laws of the land." He allows that "it is scarcely possible to believe that these imputations could have been *wholly* fictitious or unfounded;" but then he adds, with an unfortunate treachery of memory, forgetful of what he had just before written, "that nothing can be more incredible than the assertion, that the object of the conspirators was no less than the dissolution of the whole fabric of society."* The reverend writer had already allowed that "the whole fabric of society was in some hazard from their principles."† A more diverting and damning instance of self-contradiction never could have been exhibited; and it speaks strongly as to the utter untruthfulness of Protestant writers on subjects in which the Church is concerned. We conceive our readers are pretty well satisfied that the Lollards were dangerous to civil society. Wycliffe's biographers admit it. They add indeed, with incredible inconsistency, "Religious heresy is the crime for which they suffered, not political incendiарism." As if they had not already abundantly established, by their own admissions, that the religious heresy was suppressed, because it had led to political incendiарism. The facts fully prove this. Not until after the rebellion of 1381 was Wycliffe cited and condemned. Not until after the insurrection of Cobham was the statute referred to enacted. Truly, if the prelates are to be accused of tepidity, they cannot be charged with *intolerance*. It is perfectly plain that the heresy was only interfered with when it had become detrimental to society. And in ad-

* Le Bas, p. 418.

† Ibid. 413.

mitting that this was so, and alleging that nevertheless legislation was directed against the heresy, its apologists do but make its condemnation all the plainer; for this proves the conviction of the Legislature, that the heresy had given rise to the rebellion. And be it remembered, that this was no legislature bigotted and devoted to Rome. On the contrary, the whole history of the age shows that their temper was the reverse; and the life of Wycliffe clearly reveals that parliament was at first favourably disposed towards his principles. The king, we are told, favoured the heretics. The princes of the blood appeared openly as their patrons. The originator of the heresy was patronized by the Crown, and abetted by the nobility. Yet in spite of all this, the conviction was forced upon the rulers of this realm, that Lollardism, which was only Puritanism, i. e., consistent, simple Protestantism, was prejudicial to the peace and tranquillity of the country. Later ages proved the truth of this conviction, and attested it by painful experience. The civil war and the revolution; the murder of one king and the dethronement of another; the destruction of the Crown and the National Church, and the disruption of society;—stand in our history as the landmarks which show the fierce turbulence and fatal influence of the Puritanism which had its rise with Wycliffe, its triumph in the Reformation, and its retribution in the Great Rebellion and the Revolution.

Such then, on the testimony of the anti-papal semi-schismatical parliaments of the age of Edward III. and Henry IV., was the tendency of the teaching of Wycliffe. And this is the man with whom even a clergyman of the Church of England acknowledges on the whole a cordial sympathy, and in whose character and career the learned Dissenter sees so much to admire and revere, that after a lapse of twenty years' time he returns to the theme again with renewed ardour and increased enthusiasm. What can we do but exclaim again with Dr. Newman, “Oh the onesidedness of Protestantism!” After all, this is the secret. It is simply onesidedness. The difference between our description of Wycliffe's career and character and his biographers', is only this; that we take into consideration *all* the surrounding circumstances and contemporary facts of his history, and they carefully exclude all save such as suit their purpose. They are silent as to the true character of his patrons, and conceal the real reasons of his con-

duct. They come to their work with a purpose to answer, and preconceived conclusions to confirm ; and they record nothing which does not answer their purpose, or would disturb their conclusions. Their purpose is to represent the See of Rome in odious colours, and their conclusions are to canonize all its assailants as apostles. They forget that something more is necessary to make an apostle than abuse of the powers that be ; that covetous princes were likelier to be robbers than reformers ; and that they who pander to such men, and receive from them rich preferments as the reward of their labours, are suspicious preachers of a purer faith. “What went ye out for to see ? a *prophet* ? Behold, they that are gorgeously attired and fare sumptuously live in *kings' palaces*.” Kings are dangerous reformers of a wealthy Church, and kings' chaplains doubtful instruments of kings in the work of such a reformation. All Wycliffe's labours tended to enrich his royal patrons,—and himself ; and his history shows that to the question of truth or falsehood he was indifferent. And this, we repeat, is the man whom learned Protestants canonize as a confessor ! What a religion must that be which is content to find its apostles in impostors, and its confessors in interested hypocrites !

When the mind is onesided, and sees only what suits it, of course the lapse of time only augments its error, and strengthens its delusion. Hence after the lapse of twenty years the dissenting Dr. Vaughan resumes his eulogies on the character of a man, who offered Mass, although he blasphemed it, and administered absolution, although he denied it. Incredible the hallucination under which he sees in the history of such a man anything but immorality ; blind, not only to his heresy, but his hypocrisy ! and insensible to the inconsistency of admiring a man who, if he did not believe in the mysteries of the Catholic faith down to the moment of his death, acted as if he did so, though he had written as if he did *not* ; whose works, therefore, refute his words, and whose acts involved him in this inextricable dilemma, that either he destroys his own character or condemns his own teaching !

We have spoken throughout of the biography of Mr. Le Bas, but it is based on the earlier and more elaborate work of Dr. Vaughan ; and though more compact, is not so complete. All that onesided learning could achieve to illustrate his subject, Dr. Vaughan accomplished in his

first publication. It would be useless to enter further into the merits of a work which doubtless has long been out of print. And on the other hand, as to his recent publication, as it is but the same matter in a different (and more elegant) form, it is hardly necessary to notice in detail what we have already dealt with in substance. His varied historical works, learned and elegant, entitle him to the epithet of the Nonconformist Hallam, and as we cordially appreciate his scholarship, we admit at once his sincerity and ability. But it is beyond the power even of minds like his to prop up a cause resting on perversion of facts and one-sided statements of truth which have all the effect of falsehood. Works like these, although their immediate effect may be injurious, must ultimately tend to advance the cause of the Church. It is the fate of falsehood to be detected, and the detection brings with it a tremendous reaction. Candid and considerate minds will not fail to discover the fallacies of biographies or histories written with a systematic misrepresentation or suppression of all the most material facts; and since the works of Mr. Le Bas and Dr. Vaughan were put forth, twenty years ago, the progress of Catholicism has shewn the influence of truth. The writer is one of large numbers of Protestants who since then have acknowledged its power: and who are persuaded that, to all dispassionate minds, the fair consideration of the character and career of Wycliffe is of itself an ample testimony to the truth which he denied, and the faith which he blasphemed.

ART. V.—*Reminiscences of an Emigrant Milesian.—The Irish Abroad and at Home; in the Camp, and at the Court; with Souvenirs of "the Brigade."* 3 vols. 8vo. London: Bentley, 1853.

WHEN we opened these curious and interesting volumes, our first impression was, that we had lighted upon a new work of our old friend “the Octogenarian,” Mr. James Roche, of Cork, whose death in a ripe and honoured

old age, we have since had to deplore. The same rich and various knowledge of the men and things of the last century ; the same sharp and critical eye for the mistakes and mis-statements of the popular historians of that period ; the same tendency to digressions and episodes ; the same inexhaustible store of anecdotes ; and the same unregulated, but yet not ungraceful method of communicating them, which formed the charm of that most desultory, but yet most fascinating writer, are discernible in every page of these rambling "Reminiscences." It is true, we missed, before long, the curious research, the odd and out-of-the-way learning, the singular familiarity with books and their history, and the other countless evidences of various and profound scholarship which were wont to distinguish even the slightest and most hasty production of Mr. Roche's pen. But we fancied, for a time, that the difference might be explained by the diversity of the subject ; that the author of the "Reminiscences" sought to confine himself exclusively to personal anecdotes, and that for this purpose he had placed his curious and ready book-learning in temporary abeyance. We soon became satisfied, however, that our conjecture was unfounded ; and it is now well understood that the "Emigrant Milesian" is a gentleman otherwise well-known to English literature, and especially as the able and distinguished French correspondent, for many years, of the most influential of the London morning journals. It is clear, indeed, that he must be one whose position has afforded him rare and almost exclusive opportunities of information on the leading political occurrences of the last quarter of a century.

The main purpose of these "Reminiscences," however, is to preserve those fragmentary notices, anecdotes, and memorials, which still remain of the Irish families or individuals who, driven from the country by the exclusive laws of the last century, made for themselves a position or a name in the military, political, or ecclesiastical world abroad. It is a purpose with which we warmly sympathise, and which we would gladly see imitated by the few who still remain capable of doing so with advantage. Unfortunately the records of our countrymen abroad have almost all been oral and traditionary. The depositories of these traditions have all, with a scanty number of exceptions, passed away ; and if means be not taken to turn to permanent account

the memories of the few who still survive, before ten years more shall have elapsed, they must be lost hopelessly and for ever.

It is only due, therefore, to the spirit with which this task is undertaken in the present work, to devote to it the few pages which we are enabled to spare from the more important, though certainly less attractive, matter, which presses upon our attention. We look upon it as especially fortunate, too, that a writer so industrious and so enquiring as the author of these "Reminiscences" should have conceived the idea of committing them to paper. His position abroad, the opportunities it has afforded him of conversing with the contemporaries and friends of those whose history he has endeavoured to illustrate; and perhaps the very habit of seeking out and turning to account every fragment of intelligence, no matter how trifling, which the calling of a "Foreign Correspondent" tends to create and to develope, have peculiarly fitted him for the task; and his pages will be found to contain a mass of curious and original information regarding the Irish abroad, whose value can only be estimated by those who know by experience the hopelessness of any attempt to obtain such information through any of the ordinary mediums of historical enquiry. Of the families of the Dillons, the Lalleys, (especially Lally Tollendal,) the Walls, the O'Reillys, the O'Donnells, the O'Briens, &c., the reader will find scattered through these lively and spirited volumes, many most curious particulars, sometimes gay, sometimes grave, often humorous, more frequently touching, but always related in a dashing and interesting style, unpretending and unstudied, but yet ever bespeaking the scholar and the practised writer.

There is one serious defect in the work,—its exceeding irregularity and desultory character. The author passes off without ceremony into long, and generally unexplained digressions, often disproportioned in length to the subjects out of which they arise. But in a book which is avowedly so fragmentary, this fault interferes more with the interest than with the value of the information which is imparted.

The following particulars of the execution of Lewis XVI., which, in some respects, differ from the popular account of that memorable scene, are interesting, not only in themselves, but also as derived from the lips of one who was himself an eye-witness of its horrors:

"For the honour of Ireland, two of her sons, the celebrated Abbé Edgeworth and this simple retiring individual were in attendance on the unfortunate King Louis XVI. of France, at the moment of his execution. History mentions the Abbé Edgeworth only, but the second, the Abbé Kearney, was also present; not officially, for the powers which then ruled would have rejected a demand for a plurality of confessors or chaplains; and would probably have refused permission for even one to approach their august victim. The Abbé Kearney's presence was therefore voluntary; but I recollect his saying that if not desired by, it was known to the King that he wished to attend on that heart-rending occasion.

"The conduct of the Abbé Edgeworth on that melancholy occasion, is well known. He united the most ardent zeal of a minister of religion to courage and devotion to his royal patron in the presence of almost certain death. These, together with his other claims on respect, are inseparably connected with an event, the history of which ensures immortality to him, and sheds lustre on his country.

"Respecting the execution of the unhappy monarch Louis XVI., I spoke to the Abbé Kearney more than once. His replies were brief, and were accompanied by evidence that the subject caused him much pain. The following simple narrative is all that I could obtain from him.

"'I arrived,' said he, 'in the Place de la Révolution before the King, and managed to reach the scaffold just as the carriage in which he sat with the Abbé Edgeworth and two gendarmes approached from the Rue Royale. The front ranks of the crowd which surrounded the scaffold were principally *sans-culottes*, who evinced the most savage joy in anticipation of the impending tragedy.'

"'The scaffold was so situated as to provide for the royal sufferer a pang to which less distinguished victims were insensible. It stood between the pedestal on which had been erected a statue of Louis XV., overthrown early in the Revolution, and the issue from the garden of the Tuilleries, called the Pont Tournant. Midway between those two points, a hideous statue of Liberty raised her Gorgon head. This situation was chosen in order to realize a conception characteristic of the epoch and the frantic fiends who figured in it. It ensured that the unhappy persons on being placed on the *bascule* of the guillotine, should, in their descent from the perpendicular to the horizontal, when pushed home to receive the fatal stroke, make an obeisance to the goddess! Yes, even to that frivolity in a manner so appalling did the monsters directing those butcheries resort.'

"'For the King this position of the guillotine was, therefore, peculiarly painful, for, looking beyond the statue of Liberty, the Palace of the Tuilleries appeared at the end of the grand avenue, and upon it his last glance in this world must have rested.'

“‘ Scarcely had the King descended, when Samson, the executioner, and his aids, approached him to make his toilette, as the preparation of the victim for death was termed. He had a large head of hair, confined by a ribbon according to the fashion of the day. Upon this Samson seized with one hand, brandishing a pair of huge scissors in the other. The King, whose hands were yet free, opposed the attempt of Samson to cut off his hair, a precaution necessary, however, to ensure the operation of the axe. The executioner’s assistants rushed upon him. He struggled with them violently and long, but was at length overcome and bound. His hair was cut off in a mass and thrown upon the ground. It was picked up by an Englishman who was in front of the scaffold, and who put it in his pocket, to the scandal of the *sans-culottes*, who like him were in the first rank of spectators. As we never heard more about the circumstance, I suppose this person was murdered. When the bustle occasioned by this incident was over, the King ascended the scaffold. All that followed with regard to him is well known.’

“‘ Is it not true, Abbé,’ said I, ‘ that the Abbé Edgeworth uttered, as the King was mounting the short flight of steps leading to the scaffold, those sublime words of encouragement: “*Fils de Saint Louis, montez au ciel !*” ’

“‘ No,’ he replied ; ‘ but while the King was struggling with the executioner and his men, as I have just described, the Abbé Edgeworth recommended resignation to him, adding (and these words suggested possibly the phrase ascribed to him): “*You have only one sacrifice more to make in this life before you enjoy life eternal —submit to it.*” ’

“‘ The execution over, the Abbé Edgeworth and I were advised to withdraw as quickly as possible. I suppose the illustrious Malesherbes was present to take a last farewell of his royal master and client, for the cloak of his coachman was obtained and cast round Edgeworth, under favour of which he retired. Nevertheless he must have been pursued, for he found it necessary to take refuge in a little milliner’s shop, in the Rue du Bac, whence by a back door he made his escape.’

“‘ And you ?’

“‘ I reached home safely, but was subsequently arrested, and passed three years in the Temple.’”—*Reminiscences*, vol. ii. p. 263-268.

These, however, were not the only Irish clergymen who were witnesses of this melancholy spectacle. Although the “Milesian” does not allude to the circumstance, we think it interesting to record that the late Dean O’Shaughnessy of Killaloe, was also present at the execution of Lewis XVI. He contrived to procure the uniform of a

national guard, and passed unnoticed in the motely crowd. We believe, however, that at that time, Dean O'Shaughnessy was not in Priest's Orders. He had commenced his ecclesiastical studies before 1789 ; but they were of course interrupted by the terrible events which succeeded.

"The Milesian" has collected some very curious particulars of the history of the Irish College in Paris during the Revolution, the Empire, and the Restoration. But the general reader will feel more interested in the following anecdote of the Reign of Terror,—the escape of the late Dr. MacMahon, an eminent Irish physician, resident in Paris, and well-known for years to all Irish visitors of the French metropolis. Dr. MacMahon was the nephew of a physician of the household of Lewis XVI., a circumstance quite sufficient to secure for him a place in the list of *suspects* during this fearful time. After a long concealment in Paris, he was at last, by the kindness of a friend in favour, provided with the means of escaping in disguise, as one of a corps of volunteers, who were to march to the frontiers, and were to be paraded at the Mairie previous to their departure. The experiment was a hazardous one, but MacMahon was only too happy to encounter the risk.

"MacMahon did not proceed to the place of rendezvous on the day which was to determine his fate, until nearly eleven o'clock, in order as he hoped to be able to mix himself up in a crowd. He did in fact find a very considerable number of volunteers already assembled, and breathed more freely at the prospect of escaping the eyes of dangerous inquisitors. What was his horror, however, at hearing that the volunteers were to be drawn up in single files at each side of the Porte Cochère and passage leading to the Mairie, and to find that he was appointed, because of his low stature, to the last place of the left hand file coming from the Mairie, and would consequently be the first in view of the authorities, civil and military, who were to arrive to witness and applaud the departure of the section of the Cordeliers to combat the enemies of the Republic.

"The first of the expected officers who arrived was his friend. On perceiving MacMahon, he started back : 'You are lost !' said he, on beholding the exposed situation of his trembling *protégé*. 'The names of the volunteers enrolled will be read out, in order that they may receive a fraternal cheer from their fellow-citizens. With that you have nothing to do ; but afterwards will be read a list of suspected persons, who, it is thought possible, may, as you purpose, seek to escape the punishment of their *incivisme*. Your name

is on that list. I need hardly caution you against answering when it is called. We must see, in the meanwhile, if it be possible to put you less in view.'

" He then exclaimed, in a loud voice : ' No, citizen! you cannot expect a place so distinguished as that you occupy. It is all very well to parade your patriotism, but you are under size. Men of better appearance must first meet the eye of the representatives. Here ! Let a dozen citizens of those at the head of the column pass hither; and let those diminutive, but of course equally excellent citizens, take ground to the centre. (This was in the darkest part of the Port Cochère.) That will do ! One word more, citizen,' said he, in an under-tone. ' Present arms to the representatives as they pass, and contrive to conceal your face with your musket. Everything depends upon it. When the order to march is given, step into the centre of the column, and be sure to imitate your comrades in crying, "Vive la République !" Good-bye ! I can do no more. We may meet again.'

" Having said this, with an haughty air he strode up to the Mairie.

" The change of the position which MacMahon originally held in the columns, so kindly recommended by his friend, preserved him. The representatives and other authorities arrived at the Mairie precisely as the clock struck the hour of noon ; for the fashion of the day in such matters was punctuality—a virtue assumed by all the consular, imperial, and royal rulers of France who have succeeded to the Republic One and Indivisible. Scarce perceiving the double file of volunteers, the Commissaire de la Convention proceeded to the Mairie, on the step of which stood the Mayor himself, anxious (for he was in heart and soul an aristocrat) to recommend himself by well-assumed zeal and thorough obsequiousness to those whose nod would have been as sure a sentence of immediate execution as if uttered by Robespierre himself.

" After an interchange of salutations, the representative harangued the citizens assembled in the court of the Mairie on the sacrifices (life being the least of these) which all citizens were bound to make for the country. He then, followed by his staff and attendants, passed down the right hand line of volunteers. Having arrived at the extremity, he turned to the left. He stopped before the second man of the file : ' Do my eyes deceive me ? ' he cried. ' Are you not the son of the ex-noble D—— ?'

" ' Yes ! ' stammered the young man thus addressed.

" ' And you dare to associate yourself with real patriots ! You, whose family has figured at all the fêtes of St. Germain, Versailles, the Trianons, and whose unworthy parent was one of the suite of the Austrian in her visit to the Gardes Suisses, on the 4th of October ! '

" ' The principles and the position of my ancestors I do not deny, citizen representative ; but the country being proclaimed in danger,

I hoped it would be permitted to the grandson of one of the conquerors at Fontenoy, to aid in the expulsion of the enemies of France from the territory of the Republic.'

"A murmur of approbation commenced in the circle which surrounded the representative, but a stern regard from the tyrant repressed it instantly.

" 'To the Abbaye with the aristocrat!' he almost roared, and rapidly ascended the line, too much taken up with his passion to observe attentively the many trembling auditors of the sentence he had pronounced, for such in fact it was.

"The names of the volunteers were then read aloud by an officer. Each answering by the word 'present,' and receiving a cheer of approbation from the assembly. This being over, another test was produced from the packet of the *greffier* of the Revolutionary Tribunal, which that functionary also read aloud. To the first name uttered there was no reply. To the second, a youth of seventeen, of a most interesting appearance, responded. 'Advance,' said the *greffier*. The young man went forward, and made a profound obeisance to the representative, who eyed him with the aspect of a fiend. 'Stand aside,' said the *greffier*, and resumed reading from his list. As it was alphabetically arranged, eight other unhappy persons acknowledged themselves present, and were similarly with the first placed aside, before 'Patrick MacMahon' was pronounced. No reply. 'Does any citizen recognise MacMahon among those present?' asked the *greffier*. A silence so complete ensued, that MacMahon feared the beating of his heart would be heard. No answer having been given, the *greffier* proceeded, and three other unfortunates were added to the nine already marked. The word 'march!' was almost immediately afterwards given, and the column of volunteers of the section of the School of Medicine, or of the Cordeliers, as it was indifferently termed, was put in motion for the frontier, which MacMahon safely reached.

"He served throughout that campaign as a voltigeur, but his quality of student of medicine becoming known, he was transferred to the medical staff, in which he distinguished himself by humanity, assiduity, and skill, and after two more years of service was allowed to return to Paris."—p. 284-291.

To obviate the danger of jealousy on the part of the O'Reillys, from any undue prominence which might appear to be given to the rival sept of MacMahon, we must extract a story apropos to their own name and kindred. It has the additional interest of containing a characteristic anecdote of "the Duke."

"The recorded bon-mots of the Duke of Wellington are fewer than those of his great antagonist, Napoleon. Although it breaks

the course of my narrative, therefore I hope the reader will pardon the interruption.

"Attached to one of the regiments of the British army in the Peninsula was a surgeon of the name of O'Reilly. He was as tall, as springy, and as slim as Ireland, 'the Flying Phenomenon,' whom some people in London and Dublin will remember to have seen at Astley's Amphitheatre, hopping (for such was the movement) over half-a-dozen horses side by side, but at a distance of a yard from each other. Surgeon O'Reilly was the lightest-footed and one of the lightest-hearted fellows in the British army, and in this latter quality only exceeded by his and my old friend, Maurice Quill. He did not spend all his time in professional business or amusement, however. He had a great facility in the acquisition of languages, and applied himself first to the study of the languages of Spain and Portugal respectively. Having acquired them, he sought to attain a knowledge of the patois of the inhabitants of whatever district he happened to be quartered in.

"One day, on a somewhat important occasion, a peasant was brought before the Duke, and was questioned by him touching the topography and statistics of the neighbourhood, the strength and movements of the enemy, &c. The man did not understand the questions, and consequently could not reply to them. In this dilemma somebody mentioned surgeon O'Reilly. He was immediately sought and presented to the Duke, who dictated to him a series of questions upon which to examine the peasant. The latter understood O'Reilly perfectly, and was equally understood by him. After the examination both were dismissed by the Duke.

"In the course of the following week the Duke was riding in the neighbourhood of his quarters, and was surprised to observe a complete field of officers, of all ranks and arms, at some distance off, and occasionally between him and the horizon a white body would rise and fall, each appearance being more and more remote.

"'What is all this?' asked the Duke.

"'An officer of his staff rode off, and returned laughing. 'It is only Surgeon O'Reilly, sir,' said he, 'engaged in one of his steeple-chases.'

"'Who are his competitors?'

"'He has none, sir: but he considers that a race over a certain distance, necessitating a number of extraordinary leaps, in height or length, is a steeple-chase. The whole camp is occupied at this moment with one of them.'

"The Duke rode on without further remark.

"Some months or years later, O'Reilly had occasion to seek a favour at the hands of his illustrious commander and fellow 'Meathian,' and ventured to recall to his Grace the service he had had the good fortune to render in the examination of the peasant. The Duke had forgotten the circumstance, for he remarked, 'I have no

recollection of the qualities of your head, but a perfect remembrance of those of your heels.'”—*Reminiscences*, i. 191—4.

It would have been well if the writer had confined himself more closely to these and similar *purely Irish* recollections. But he has mixed up with them so much of other matter, (frequently with but little novelty to recommend it,) as to mar their effect very sensibly. Nevertheless, we cheerfully resign ourselves to these drawbacks; and we gladly and gratefully accept, for its own sake, what he has added to our scanty stock of information on a portion of our history to which no true Irish Catholic can be indifferent.

ART. VI.—1. *Hippolytus und Kallistus; oder die Römische Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts.* [Hippolytus and Callistus; or, the Roman Church in the first Half of the Third Century.] Von J. DOELLINGER, 8vo. Regensburg, 1853.

2. *Ueber Hippolytus, die ersten Monarchianer, und die Römische Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts.* [On Hippolytus, the Monarchians, and the Roman Church in the first half of the Third Century.] Von Dr. J. C. L. GIESELER, [Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Viertes Heft, 1853.] Hamburg, 1853.
3. *Ueber die neu-entdeckten Philosophumena,* [On the newly-discovered Philosophumena.] Von Dr. Hergenröther, [Theologische Quartalschrift, von Dr. v. Drey, Dr. v. Kuhn, Dr. Hefele, Dr. Welte, Dr. Zukrigl, und Dr. Aberle, Dritter Quartalheft 1852.] Tübingen, 1852.
4. *Ueber den wahren Verfasser des unter dem Titel Philosophumena Originis jüngst erschienenen Werkes von Dr. Jos. Fessler* [Zweites Quartalheft,] Tübingen, 1852.
5. *Leipziger Repertorium der Deutschen und Auslandischen Literatur, von Dr. J. G. Gersdorf.* Leipzig, 1853.
6. *Etudes sur de Nouveaux Documents Historiques, empruntées à l'Ouvrage récemment découvert des Philosophumena.* Par M. L' ABBE CRUICE, Chanoine de Paris, Supérieur de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Ecclesiastiques des Carmés. Paris, Perisse, Frères, 1853.

7. *Etudes Critiques sur le Livre publié par M. Miller sous le Titre de Philosophumena Origenis.* Par M. M. L'ABBE E. FREPPEL, et CHARLES LENNORMANT. [Le Correspondant. Tome xxxi. 9^{me} Livraison.] Paris, 1853.
8. *St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome in the earlier part of the Third Century, from the newly-discovered Philosophumena.* By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D. D., 8vo. London, Rivingtons, 1853.
9. *Hippolytus and the Christian Church of the Third Century.* By W. ELFE TAYLER, author of "Popery, its Character and its Crimes." London, Hall and Virtue, 1853.
10. *Hippolytus und seine Zeit. Anfänge und Ansichten des Christentums und der Menschheit.* Von CT. C. J. BUNSEN. Aus dem englischen übersetzt von dem Herrn Lic. Raub. Leipzig, 1852.
11. Οργένος φιλοσοφομένα, ἡ κάτα πασῶν ἀρέσεων ἀλέγχος. Origenis Philosophumena: Sive Omnia Hæresium Refutatio. E. Codice Parisino nunc primum edidit EMMANUEL MILLER. Oxonii, 1851.

THIS long catalogue, (which, long as it is, is far from including all the publications that have appeared on the subject of the Philosophumena since we last brought it under the notice of our readers,) may serve to show with how much interest it still continues to be regarded in the theological world. There is no shade of doctrinal subdivision which will not be found represented in the controversy. Catholics of the very highest school, like Dr. Döllinger and Lenormant; Protestants of every possible variety of opinion; High-Churchmen like Dr. Wordsworth; evangelicals like Mr. Elfe Tayler; and even rationalists of the very boldest views, like Baur and Gieseler, have met upon this, as a common debatable land; each seeking to draw therefrom advantage for his own peculiar opinions, or to repel the attack of his adversaries, of which it has been made the medium.

When we last addressed ourselves to the subject, the main topic of controversy regarding the Philosophumena was its authorship. The publications now before us may serve, by the singular diversity of opinion which they exhibit, to show the unlearned reader in what difficulties this important question is even still involved. Confidently as M. Bunsen had pronounced in favour of Hippolytus, the discussion has still been held open. Almost every conjecture to which we alluded when last we wrote, can still boast one or more advocates; and even those who agree with M. Bunsen in regarding Hippolytus as the author,

not only differ from him as to the grounds of this judgment, but even confess that the grounds which he put forward were, as we ourselves endeavoured to show, utterly untenable.

The variety of the opinions, indeed, both among Catholic and Protestant critics, if it were not too perplexing, might furnish no inconsiderable amount of amusement. In the well-known French critical journal, *Le Correspondant*,* for example, the Abbé Freppel expresses himself very confidently in favour of the Hippolytus theory: and yet in precisely the same number of the same journal, M. Lenormant returns to the exploded opinion of the authorship of Origen.† In the *Tübingen Theologische Quartalschrift*, Dr. Fessler‡ adopts the opinion that the writer must have been the Roman priest, Caius; while, in the very next issue of that learned publication, Dr. Hergenröther§ maintains in a long and elaborate dissertation, that he cannot have been other than Hippolytus. In like manner the Abbé Jallabert, rejecting the claims both of Origen and Hippolytus, conceives that it may, with more probability, be ascribed to Tertullian; while the Abbé Cruice agrees with him in setting aside the pretensions of Origen and Hippolytus, but is undecided between those of Tertullian, Caius, and some unknown Novatian heretic.|| So, again, among Protestants, the Ecclesiastic and Theologian maintains the authorship of Caius;¶ the *Quarterly Review* acquiesces in the Origen theory; and Dr. Baur revives the claim of the Roman priest.** The *Christian Remembrancer*, without expressing any very positive view as to the actual author, is most earnest and indeed contemptuous in rejecting M. Bunsen's proofs of the authorship of Hippolytus. Dr. Gieseler, on the contrary, unhesitatingly adopts M. Bunsen's views as to the authorship of Hippolytus, although he differs from him as to many important particulars regarding his personal history.†† And to crown the

* February, 1853, p. 509, and fol.

† P. 521 and fol.

‡ Zweites Quartal-heft, 1852, p. 299, and fol.

§ Drittes Quartal-heft, p. 416 and fol.

|| "Etudes," p. 145. ¶ June and July, 1851.

** Theolog. Jarhbuch, 1853. Heft, 1 and 3.

†† Theolog. Studien und Kritiken, 1853. Viertes Heft, p. 762. and fol.

climax of perplexity, Dr. Wordsworth, while he agrees with M. Bunsen in rejecting the claims of Origen and of Caius, and in acknowledging the authorship of Hippolytus, not only differs from him as to the proofs upon which he rests the opinions, but actually demonstrates it to be utterly impossible that Hippolytus could have been the author of *that* treatise *Against all Heresies*, to which M. Bunsen vindicates his claim !

It is with all these conflicting opinions before him that Dr. Döllinger has entered upon this important critical enquiry; and we do not hesitate to pronounce the "*Hippolytus and Callistus*" one of his most successful productions. It exhibits, in rare and happy combination, all the profound and various erudition of which he is so distinguished a master, with the acuteness, sagacity, and moderation, which have placed him at the very head of the critical historians of modern Germany.

Before we enter upon an analysis of this most able essay, however, we think it necessary to devote a few pages to the work of Dr. Wordsworth, which, although singularly inconclusive in its dogmatical argument, and far from being perfectly satisfactory in that portion of the critical enquiry which pretends *positively* to determine the question of the authorship, is yet very successful in the controversy with the Chevalier Bunsen, as to the proofs on which he relies in establishing the claim of Hippolytus.

Our readers may possibly remember the general line of argument by which, in our former essay upon the subject, we endeavoured to combat the very positive statements of M. Bunsen; and especially to show that, although he had proved beyond all possibility of question that Hippolytus had written a Treatise against Heresies, resembling the so-called *Philosophumena* in its general structure and subject, yet he had completely failed in the proof that the *Philosophumena* is that Treatise. We showed,* not only that the ancient testimonies on which he relies as identifying the present treatise with *that* work of Hippolytus to which they refer, do not satisfactorily establish that identity, but in truth rather establish precisely the reverse. We showed that the passage on the subject of the Quartodeciman Heresy, which St. Peter of Alexandria cites from Hippolytus's treatise, is not found in our *Philosophumena*; that there is a similar failure of proof as to a quotation

* *Supra*, vol. xxxiii. pp. 369 and fol.

from Hippolytus's treatise given by the author of the work *De Duabus Naturis*; above all, that the description of Hippolytus's "*Against all Heresies*," given by Photius in his *Bibliotheca*, is utterly irreconcileable with the reality before us,—that Photius's Hippolytus was a "little treatise," [$\betaι\betaλιδάριον$] while ours (though nearly a fourth is wanting) is a large volume; that Photius's book contained "just thirty-two heresies," while ours contains thirty-seven, or, perhaps, thirty-eight; that Photius's list of heresies began with the Dositheans, while ours commences with the Nasassenes or Ophites, a sect of a totally different character; that Photius's list closed with the Noetians, while ours proceeds to enumerate no less than five additional sects; that Photius takes no notice whatever of the portion of the work properly called "*Philosophumena*," the notices of the Pagan philosophers,—while those notices occupy nearly one half of our volume; and finally, that Photius's work denied the authenticity of St. Paul's Epistles to the Hebrews, whereas ours contains no such denial.

Dr. Wordsworth urges the same series of arguments with great success against the opinion of Chevalier Bunsen. He maintains, nevertheless, that the arguments against all the other names which have been suggested as claimants for the authorship are even more decisive; and we fully concur in the force and conclusiveness of the reasoning by which he sets aside the claims of Origen and of Caius. He himself, therefore, falls back upon the name of Hippolytus, but upon grounds entirely different from those of the Chevalier Bunsen. He contends, that although the work to which Photius and the other ancient writers refer as written by Hippolytus, may, and indeed must have been, different from ours, yet it by no means follows, that *our Treatise also* may not be by Hippolytus. He suggests that Hippolytus may have written *two treatises*,—a shorter one, which is the [$\betaι\betaλιδάριον$] of Photius, and a more extensive one, which we now discover in the *Philosophumena*. This practice, he contends, was not unusual among ancient authors, and he enumerates several examples of it, both in sacred and profane literature.*

* We must say, however, that these examples are far from affording any satisfactory parallel for a case such as that before us; they will be found in pp. 701.

And in the case of Hippolytus, he thinks there is actual evidence of its having been done.

"We have good reason for believing, that St. Hippolytus wrote two Treatises against Heresy : first, a Compendium ; then afterwards, a longer treatise. In speaking thus, we think that we have the authority of St. Hippolytus himself.

"In the Introduction to the newly-discovered Treatise the author thus writes :—'No fable of those who are famous among heathens is to be rejected. Their incoherent dogmas are rather to be regarded as credible, on account of the greater infatuation of heretics, who have been supposed by many to worship God, because they hide and disguise their ineffable mysteries. *Whose dogmas we expounded some time ago with brevity, not exhibiting them in detail, but refuting them rather in rude generality; not thinking it would be requisite to drag their secrets to the light,*—in order that when we had shown their tenets as it were darkly, they being filled with shame lest we should speak out their mysteries plainly, and show them to be infidels, might in some degree relinquish their irrational principles and godless designs. But since I perceive that *they have no feeling of regard for our moderation*, and that they do not consider that God, Who is blasphemed by them, is long-suffering, in order that either through compunction they may repent, or if obstinate, they may be justly punished, *I am constrained to come forward, and to disclose their secret mysteries, which they deliver with great confidence to those who are initiated by them.* And though the subject compels us to launch forth on a wide sea of demonstration, I do not deem it fit to be silent, *but will exhibit in detail the dogmas of them all.* And though our argument will be long, yet it seems right not to flag. For we shall bequeath to posterity a no slight boon, so that they may no longer be deceived, when all behold manifestly the secret orgies of heretics, which they deliver only to their neophytes.'

"Let us remember also, that, as we learn from Photius, the bibliodion of Hippolytus terminated with Noetus and the Noetians.

"Now it appears from our Treatise, that *after* Noetus another heresy broke forth, derived in part from that of Noetus,—namely, the CALLISTIAN Heresy ; and that it made great havoc in the Roman Church, and that our author had the principal share in checking its progress. Accordingly, in the Ninth Book he begins as it were afresh, and devotes a great part of that Book to the Callistian heresy, and to another still later heresy, which he describes as owing its progress at Rome to Callistian, viz., the heresy of the Elchasaites.

"We see, then, that our author had written an earlier work on heresy ; and in the History of the Callistian and Elchasaites heresies subsequent to the Noetian, we perceive another very good reason

why he should have written a second Treatise on heresy, if the former work which he had written had *ended* with Noetus.

“Thus, then, we find it stated as a fact by our author in the newly-discovered treatise,—

“1. That he had already, some time since ($\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota$), written a book against heresy;

“2. That the former work was a compendious one; and

“3. He states some reasons for writing *another* Treatise more in detail.

“We are, therefore, now led to enquire, whether we can find an earlier and shorter work on heresy which we may assign to our author.

“Now, supposing our author to be St. Hippolytus—(which we have good reason to do, from our author's age and position in the Western Church, and from his authorship of a ‘Work on the Universe,’ quoted in this Treatise as written by our author, and known from the list on the Statute to be written by *Hippolytus*)—we find that a shorter work on heresy is ascribed to him, corresponding in character to that of which we are now in search.

“Such a work, we say, was written by Hippolytus; it was inscribed with his name, and was read by Photius. It was a *short* work—for it is called *biblidarion*. It was probably not in several successive books, like our Treatise, but contained in a *single book*, like that annexed to the *Præscriptiones* of Tertullian. And it is not unlikely that the heresies were *numbered* in it consecutively, and that each was dispatched in a few paragraphs respectively, as is the case in the work on heresy by Philastrius (circ. A. D. 350). Otherwise, we can hardly see why Photius should call it ‘A Little Book against *thirty-two* heresies.’ For would he have taken the pains to *count* them? Would he have described it as such? It seems also to have been written a considerable time *before* our work, for it was not formed from the work of Irenæus against heresy, but from his *lectures*, and was published as a compendium of them. The work of Irenæus was finished about A. D. 190, and he died about A. D. 202; whereas our author refers to facts that did not take place till about A. D. 220. It also *ended* with the Noetians, and does not appear to have said anything of the Callistians, and certainly did not go on (as ours does) to describe the heresy of Elchasai.

“Hence, therefore, the description by Photius of *another* work on heresy by *Hippolytus*, *different* from our Treatise, so far from invalidating the evidence already adduced to show that our Treatise was written by Hippolytus, comes in as an additional proof that the newly-discovered Treatise is from him.

“Our author wrote *two* works on heresy. The present work is described by him as the latter and longer work of the two. If, then, our author is Hippolytus, we may expect to find another earlier and shorter work than the present written by Hippolytus. We

do find such a work. Therefore a new argument thence arises—that our author is Hippolytus."—pp. 70—74.

The idea of this twofold treatise had already been suggested by the author of the articles in the *Ecclesiastic*. It is also distinctly put forward in Gersdorf's *Repertorium*, by Dr. Duncker, to whom Jacobi refers in his essay on the system of the Gnostic Basilides,* as it is illustrated by the present work. A further step, too, has been since taken. It has been attempted to identify the earlier and more compendious treatise, which is alluded to in the extract given by Dr. Wordsworth, from the Preamble of the *Philosophumena*.

A cursory reader of Tertullian's book, *De Prescriptionibus Hæreticorum*, might fail to observe that it consists of two parts, quite distinct from each other, although, in the ordinary editions of that father, not printed under separate forms. It is now universally admitted, however, that the last eight chapters, beginning at the forty-fifth, form an appendix to the Treatise of the Prescriptions, and have been added as such by a modern hand. These chapters are wanting in some of the MSS. In others they are placed as a distinct treatise; sometimes without a title, sometimes with the express title, *Adversus omnes Hæreses*. But they are allowed by all not to be Tertullian's; and even as early as the end of the seventeenth century, the Huguenot refugee divine, Allix, had conjectured that this little catalogue of heresies was the very *βιβλιδαριον* of Hippolytus, which Photius describes in his *Bibliotheca*. It is now more probably conjectured that the Appendix of the Prescriptions is not an exact translation of the *βιβλιδαριον*, but an abridgment, and perhaps a modification, of it, adapted to the views and tastes of Roman readers and members of the Western Church generally.†

We have no special desire to raise difficulties against this ingenious and plausible conjecture as to the two treatises. But although it reckons the very highest names (and among them that of Dr. Döllinger) in the list of its patrons, we cannot even still admit it as more than a conjecture. We cannot overlook the fact that there is no early authority whatever for the exist-

* Basilidis Gnostici Sententias ex Hippoliti Libro κάτα πασῶν ἀρέσεων, illustravit, J. J. Jacobi. Berolini, 1852.

† *Christian Remembrancer*. Jan. 1853, p. 229.

ence of a second treatise "Against all Heresies" by Hippolytus. Neither Eusebius, nor St. Jerome, nor Theodore, not even any of the later Greeks, especially Photius, alludes to any but a single treatise under his name. Now if the *Philosophumena* had been known to them as his, it would have stared them in the face in the very first page of the preface, that the author had already written a shorter treatise upon the same subject. Nor is there much more reason for identifying the short treatise appended to the *Prescriptions* as that described by the early authorities, than there is for the *Philosophumena* itself. It is true that it is strictly a [$\betaι\betaλι\delta\muον$] that it "contains thirty-two heresies," that it "begins with the Dositheans," and ends, if not with the Noetians, at least with a kindred heresy, that of Praxeas. But on the other hand, there is no more trace in it* than in the *Philosophumena*, of the passages quoted by the ancients from the treatise of Hippolytus; no vestige of the passage quoted by St. Peter of Alexandria, on the Quarto-Decimans; none of that on the Divinity of Christ cited by Gelasius; none of the denial of the authenticity of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews specified by Photius; and no trace of that allusion to St. Irenaeus which he mentions as occurring in the [$\betaι\betaλι\delta\muον$] read for him. In one word, we think it is perfectly clear that the present appendix to the *Prescriptions* of Tertullian is either a totally different treatise from that described by Photius and cited by the other ancient authorities, or is so modified by the Latin translator as to be no longer recognizable as the same. The very utmost that can be said is, it may have been compiled from the $\betaι\betaλι\delta\muον$, which Photius ascribed to Hippolytus. But until that treatise itself shall have been more fully and satisfactorily identified, we cannot allow to Dr. Wordsworth that it furnishes any new argument in favour of Hippolytus's claim to the authorship of the *Philosophumena*.

It is not our intention, however, to dwell upon the critical portion of Dr. Wordsworth's essay. We are much more concerned with the polemical use to which (like all the other Protestant critics of the *Philosophumena*) he has endeavoured to turn the supposed results of his enquiry. Our readers will probably remember the scandalous story about Callistus which is contained in the ninth book of the

* See Tertul. Opp. vol. ii. pp. 51, et seq. [Semler's Edition.]

Philosophumena, and the inferences, both as to the doctrine and discipline of the Roman Church in that age which M. Bunsen drew therefrom. Dr. Wordsworth presses the story of Callistus still more earnestly into service. Not content with the purely historical authority which attaches to the narrative from the fact of its author having been a contemporary of Callistus, and an eye-witness of the events which he records, he urges with special confidence the circumstance of his having been bishop of Portus, of his having been permitted to remain, not only without ecclesiastical censure, but even in peaceful and honoured possession of his full rank till his death, and of his being even still "revered by prelates, cardinals, and pontiffs, and enshrined in the Vatican."

We shall state Dr. Wordsworth's argument in his own language, in order that the reader may see how important an element of it is formed by the reputed sanctity and venerable name of the supposed author of the *Philosophumena*.

He applies the authority of Hippolytus to the solution of two very important controversies, and especially as affording a practical commentary on the celebrated passage of St. Irenæus, (Hær. iii. c. 3,) on the necessity of all Churches "conforming to the Church of Rome, on account of its more powerful principality." We need hardly remind our readers that the Greek original of this important passage is lost, and that it is known to modern controversy only from the old Latin version. Not so, however, Dr. Wordsworth argues, in the days of St. Hippolytus.

"*St. Hippolytus* had this passage before him in the original *Greek*. He had the advantage of personal intercourse with St. Irenæus; he was his pupil, had heard his lectures, and gave an abstract of them to the world. He was formed in his school.

"How then did St. Hippolytus understand this passage of St. Irenæus? How did he show that he understood it, by *his own practice*?

"This becomes an interesting topic, not merely as bearing on the passage itself, but as of far more extensive import. For it aids us in deciding aright a question on which the whole controversy turns between the Church of Rome and the other Churches of Christendom; viz.—

"Whether the claim put forth by the Bishop of Rome to spiritual supremacy is an equitable claim? Was it acknowledged as such by the primitive Church?

"Whether the Papal claim to Infallibility is a just claim or not? Was it admitted—was it even known—in primitive times?

"An answer to these enquiries is contained in the newly-discovered volume before us.

"It exhibits the condition of the Church of Rome, and displays the conduct and teaching of two Bishops of Rome in succession, Zephyrinus and Callistus, in the writer's own age, the beginning of the third century, that is, just *after* the *decease* of St. Irenæus, not more than a hundred years after the death of the last surviving Apostle.

"The person who wrote this history was a scholar of St. Irenæus; he was a Suffragan Bishop of the Roman Church; one who passed his life at or near Rome; one who was honoured in his day, and has ever since been honoured, as among the most eminent Teachers of the Church; one, whom the Church of Rome herself now venerates as a Martyr, and commemorates as a Saint, in her Breviary; one, whose Statue she has received with honourable marks of distinction within the doors of the Vatican, and has placed in the Pontifical Library, where it now is—St. HIPPOLYTUS.

"What, then, let us enquire, is *his* testimony with respect to the Bishop of Rome? Did he regard him as Supreme Head of the Church Universal? Did he think it the duty of all men, did he think it his own duty, to submit to him as such? Did he venerate him as infallible? Does he give any intimation that the Bishops of Rome were looked upon as Supreme or Infallible by others, or even by themselves? Had the Bishops of Rome put forth any claims to Supremacy or Infallibility in that age?"—pp. 205—6.

For each of these two questions he finds a distinct reply in the narrative of the *Philosophumena*. First, as to the Infallibility:—

"It is too clear from the recital contained in the Ninth Book of the recently-discovered Treatise on Heresy, that two Bishops of Rome in succession, Zephyrinus and Callistus, fell into the opposite heresy—that of Noetus.

"It is not necessary to dwell on the motives of this apostasy, or on the practices with which it was accompanied, or on the results by which it was followed. But it is requisite to state the fact. These two Bishops of Rome lapsed into heresy, in a primary article of the Christian Faith, and in opposition to the exhortations of Orthodox Teachers. They strenuously maintained that heresy, and propagated it by their official authority, as Bishops of Rome.

"They tenaciously maintained, and they promulgated publicly, a doctrine, which the Church of Rome herself, with all other Churches of Christendom, now declares to be heretical.

"They also denounced those who held the true faith. Zephyrinus and Callistus charged St. Hippolytus with Heresy.

"Hence it is apparent, that the Bishops of Rome may err, and have erred,—they may err and have erred, as Bishops of Rome—in matters of Faith.

"Therefore the Bishop of Rome is not Infallible."—pp. 210—12.

As to the Supremacy he is still more decided:—

"When Zephyrinus and Callistus fell into heresy, in the beginning of the third century, and when they endeavoured to disseminate their false doctrine, they were resisted by St. Hippolytus.

"He does not appear to have imagined that he was bound to conform to them in their doctrine. On the contrary, he stood forth boldly and rebuked them. He has thus given a practical reply to the question, which has been raised concerning the sense of St. Irenæus, his master, in the passage recited above. Hippolytus certainly had never learnt that every Church, and every Christian, must submit to the Bishop of Rome.

"Let it not be said, that he merely resisted Zephyrinus and Callistus from a transient impulse of passion, and swayed by the feelings of a moment. His resistance was deliberate; it was a resistance of years. Not only when Zephyrinus and Callistus were alive, did he think it his duty to contend against them and their heresy; but when they were in their graves, he sate down and committed to writing the History of their Heresy, and of his own opposition to it. And he published that History to the World, in order that none might be deluded by the false doctrine which those Roman Bishops had propagated, and which was disseminated after their death by some who had been deceived by them.

"He published that History after the death of Callistus, and probably in the time of his successor Urbanus. He affirms that he wrote his Treatise in the discharge of his duty as a Bishop of the Church. He therefore remained a Bishop—a Roman Suffragan,—although he had resisted two Bishops of Rome. As we know from Prudentius and others, he was Bishop of Portus even to his death. Nothing occurs in the whole course of the Ten Books to suggest any surmise that he had encountered any Ecclesiastical censure, on the ground of his having opposed Zephyrinus and Callistus; or that, by this publication, he contravened the just authority of the Bishop of Rome at the time when he published his work. Nothing exists in it to excite any suspicion, that, however the Church of Rome might regret the facts which his treatise related, she made any remonstrance against the publication, or regarded it as a breach of order and discipline. On the contrary, he promises himself the gratitude of the world for it. And he seems to have not been disappointed. The veneration in which his memory was held at Rome indicates this.

"Such was the conduct of St. Hippolytus. Such is his commentary—the commentary of his life—on the teaching of his master, Irenæus, concerning the Church of Rome."—pp. 212—13.

In our former article upon the subject of the *Philosophumena*, we entered very fully into both these difficulties;* nor will our space permit us to return to the general questions which they involve. But we must say a word or two upon the special argument which Dr. Wordsworth founds upon the authorship of Hippolytus.

It has seldom been our lot to encounter such a mass of assumptions as this portion of his essay involves. To judge from the tone which pervades it, and the cool and almost contemptuous commiseration with which the opposite opinion is dismissed, one would naturally infer that no further doubt could possibly be entertained that the author of the *Philosophumena* was Hippolytus, the doctor, martyr, and bishop of the see of Portus; or, at least, that in the discussion of these questions, Dr. Wordsworth has himself taken care to state fully, and satisfactorily resolve, all the topics of doubt or difficulty which they present.

Now what is the fact? Allowing to every argument and every authority which he has put forward its full, and even its extreme value; admitting him to have proved beyond question that the writer of the *Philosophumena* was named Hippolytus; he has not satisfactorily established, either that the Hippolytus whom he supposes to be the author of the *Philosophumena*, was St. Hippolytus, commonly reputed the bishop of Portus; or that he was a saint at all; or, above all, that at the time at which he wrote this treatise, and in the attitude which he assumes in it, he represented or expressed the feelings and views of the Church of his age, or, in truth, was even a member of her communion.

It is plain that, if Dr. Wordsworth's position be assailable in any one of these particulars, especially in the last, it is utterly valueless.

Now we contend not only that he has not established any one of them, but further, that he has been so care-

* We take this opportunity of referring to the able and erudite *Etudes* of the Abbé Cruice, as a most full and satisfactory *résumé* of the entire subject in its polemical bearing. It contains almost every material for the complete and triumphant vindication of the memory of Callistus, as well as of the orthodoxy and supremacy of his see. On this part of the subject it leaves nothing to be desired.

less or so uncritical as to overlook the most important of them altogether.

1. Dr. Wordsworth seems to take it for granted that it is quite enough to have proved the author of the *Philosophumena* to have been a Hippolytus. We shall see, before we close, that it is precisely at this point of the question its main difficulty commences.

2. He assumes as a matter of course that Hippolytus, the writer, is the same person with Hippolytus, the bishop of Portus. Or at least he contents him with a sweeping assertion that "the work of Ruggieri, published in 1771, has exhausted the subject," and that "to write more upon it now would only be 'actum agere.' " * The fact being that Ruggieri has not adduced a single authority in maintenance of his thesis earlier than the seventh century, and even at that date his authorities are exclusively oriental.

3. He assumes that Hippolytus the writer was recognized as a martyr and a saint in the early church, and it is on this circumstance he mainly builds his argument against the personal character of Callistus, as well as the supremacy of his see. Now the fact is, not only that the earliest authors (Eusebius and St. Jerome) who mention Hippolytus, the writer, make no allusion to the circumstance of his having been a martyr, but also that among the many martyrs of that name, who are enumerated in the ancient martyrologies and similar records, not one is stated to have been eminent for his writings, or even mentioned in any terms which could imply that he had been a writer at all. The examples of Hermas, Papias, Tatian, Origen, Tertullian, may suffice to show that, even as early as the time of Hippolytus, the fame of authorship and that of sanctity were entirely distinct from each other.

4. He assumes, without a single word of explanation, that the very circumstance of Hippolytus's being reputed a saint in the early Church stamps every statement of his with a special authority; or, at least, that it is an evidence that such resistance to papal authority as his own narrative reveals, was not regarded as inconsistent with the position of an orthodox bishop, and an unexceptionable member of church communion in the third century. Forgetting altogether that the title of saint in the early church was almost invariably the reward of martyrdom, and therefore that, as

a historical evidence, unsupported by other records, it imports nothing more than the mere fact that the individual to whom it has been accorded, died for the faith, or at least underwent persecution for the profession of it. In itself, it does not say a word as to the previous life of the individual; much less can it be said to stamp all the details of his previous history with the solemn approval of the church of his age. And in reference to Hippolytus himself, it is hardly necessary to say that there is not a single word or allusion discoverable in the contemporary history (or indeed in any early history whatsoever,) to throw the smallest light upon the nature of this claim of Hippolytus, the writer, to the title of a saint, or in any way to identify him with any one of the historical personages to whom that title has been assigned.

5. Above all, Dr. Wordsworth in the above argument founded on the testimony of the *Philosophumena*, has most unwarrantably kept out of view the more than doubtful orthodoxy of Hippolytus, the writer, at least in one phase of his history. To judge from the tone of the argument which he here builds upon the narrative contained in the *Philosophumena*, no one could suppose for a moment that any doubt had ever been thrown upon its credibility; still less could it be imagined, not only that Hippolytus had long been held by many eminent critics, both Catholic and Protestant, to have been for a part of his life a follower of the Novatian heresy and schism, but even that the narrative contained in the *Philosophumena* itself had been taken as a strong, if not conclusive confirmation of the belief. And yet in our former article we showed this by the clearest and most convincing arguments. Every person of name who has written upon the subject has felt the importance of this consideration; even Gieseler,* with all his rationalistic leanings, avows that it is fatal to the value of the testimony, as against Callistus; and we cannot help thinking, that, whereas Dr. Wordsworth himself, in another portion of his essay, enters at some length into the peculiar opinions or tendencies indicated by the whole tone of the narrative regarding Callistus, and endeavours to show that Hippolytus the Novatian, and Hippolytus of Portus were two different persons, it is hardly ingenuous in him to suppress this doubt altogether in the argument

* In the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1853, p. 770, 4tes Heft.

against papal supremacy which he founds upon his authority.

There are many other points of exception which we might take against Dr. Wordsworth's position, and especially the careless and uncritical spirit in which he accepts the testimony of the writer of the *Philosophumena*, as to the charges which he makes against the moral character of Callistus, and still more his imputations upon his orthodoxy. A very moderate degree of historical impartiality would have led him to suspect at least some tinges of exaggeration in statements couched in language so unmeasured, if not to dismiss many of the imputations as improbable in themselves, and irreconcilable with one another. We urged this consideration very earnestly in our former article,* and we shall see it more fully hereafter; but we cannot avoid, even here, suggesting that, had the narrative been less in accordance with Dr. Wordsworth's pre-conceived opinions, he would have subjected it to a more strict and searching investigation.

All these topics, however, and many kindred ones, will present themselves incidentally in our analysis of the admirable essay of Dr. Döllinger, from which we have already too long delayed the reader.

Dr. Döllinger unhesitatingly adopts Hippolytus as the author of the *Philosophumena*. But he is equally decided in maintaining against M. Bunsen that the "Biblidarion" of Photius was not the *Philosophumena*, but that earlier and more compendious work, to which the author alludes in his preface.

We shall not dwell upon this clear and masterly resumé of the evidence of these positions. There is more of novelty and originality in the historical discussion as to the personality of Hippolytus, which, as he justly complains, had been almost entirely overlooked by those who have preceded him. In truth, up to the present time, the question has only been considered by Protestant critics under one single aspect—its bearing upon the controversy with Rome; and its real historical significance has been either entirely overlooked in the ardour of partisanship, or perhaps studiously kept out of view, as likely to weaken the effect of the first impression of this startling story. We have already observed that the personality of the narrator of this story is a

* *Supra* xxxiii. p. 407.

most important element in the consideration of its credibility. Dr. Döllinger is fully alive to its importance ; and the curious and minute exactness with which he investigates this obscure and difficult part of the subject, presents a very striking contrast as well to the loose and uncritical declamations of Dr. Wordsworth, as to the confident but unsupported theorizing of Chevalier Bunsen.

He passes in review the various personages of this name of whom we have any record in connexion with the history of the period to which the *Philosophumena* plainly belongs. In this difficult and elaborate investigation, he has clearly availed himself of the curious and learned dissertation of Ruggieri, to which we referred in our former notice ; but he has illustrated and corrected its statements from so many sources, both collateral and independent, that his work may in this particular be held fully entitled to the praise of originality. It is hardly necessary for us to say that we can pretend to nothing beyond the merest outline of it ; but we think it right to add that we shall not confine ourselves exclusively to Dr. Döllinger, but shall draw our information, as occasion may arise, from the other writers enumerated above, as well as from the original authorities themselves.

Perhaps there is not a single author of any eminence in Christian antiquity, whose personal history has been so utterly lost as Hippolytus. Eusebius, in enumerating his works, merely calls him a bishop, without specifying his see.* Theodoret was equally in ignorance.† St. Jerome,‡ although he endeavoured, was unable to ascertain the name of his see. And it would be well if the uncertainty were purely of this negative character. But to add to the embarrassments, not only is the number of claimants for the honours of the name very considerable ; but the records, spurious and genuine, which are preserved regarding each of them, are of such a nature as to involve the question of identity in endless confusion.

A long list of martyrologies, some of the Eastern, some of the Western Church, containing the name of Hippolytus,

* Eccles. Hist. vi. 20, ἔτερας πον καὶ αυτὸς προέστως ἐκκλησίας.

† Dialog. i. p. 2.

‡ De Scriptor. Eccles. cap. lxi. Hippolytus eujusdam urbis Episcopus, (nomen quippe urbis scire non potui.)

is prefixed to Fabricius's edition of his works.* Some of these are plainly repetitions of one another; but many of them are evidently meant to describe personages totally distinct. It has commonly been said that there are three different saints of the name; but, in truth, this falls far below the reality. "In the various martyrologies," says Dr. Döllinger,† "there are enumerated five personages of this name, all martyrs, nearly all contemporary, that is to say, within the first half of the third century." He himself, however, supplies even a greater number.

The earliest entry is one in which the name of Hippolytus, a priest, is recorded, in connection with that of the Pope St. Pontian as having been banished (A. D. 235.) to the island of Sardinia, where Pontian soon afterwards died. In the acts of St. Lawrence the deacon, we find a second, who having been (while still a pagan, and an officer in the Roman army) placed in charge of St. Lawrence during his imprisonment, was by him converted and baptized, together with his whole family, and suffered martyrdom a few days afterwards, being dragged to death by wild horses. A third appears in the acts of St. Aurea, (or, in the Greek, $\chiρμοσῆ$) a virgin martyr who suffered at Ostia; her remains were reverently buried by the priest Hippolytus, and he himself, having rebuked the presiding magistrate for his impiety, was immediately condemned to be drowned. This martyrdom is stated to have occurred under the emperor Claudio, clearly the second of the name, Claudio Gothicus, who was proclaimed in 268. A fourth is recorded as having suffered in the persecution of Valerian. He was an anchorite, who had fixed his abode in a cave, near Rome, where he converted a vast number of pagans to Christianity, and at length drew upon himself the vengeance of the persecutors. A fifth is recorded as having suffered martyrdom at Antioch. He was a priest, and had been an adherent of the Novatian schism, but returned to the Church before his martyrdom. A sixth is the martyr of Portus, the celebrated hero of the hymn of St. Prudentius.‡ He is called in the hymn "Presbyterum," but is described in terms which give much plausibility to the opinion of Fronto le Duc, that in reality the poet used the

* Pp. xx. xxi.

† *Hippolytus und Callistus*, p. 25.

‡ *Περιστεφανων.* xi.

word in its generic signification, (just as, in the *Philosophumena* itself, Irenæus is twice styled* *μάκιρος πρεσβυτέρος*), of bishop as well as priest. He too is described as having formerly been an adherent of the Novatian schism; but when he was dragged away to martyrdom, he not only retracted on his own part, but exhorted the people to imitate his example:

Fugite, O miseri execranda Novati
Schismata: catholicis redditte vos populis.

The manner of his martyrdom is described as the same with that of the Hippolytus who appears in the acts of St. Lawrence the deacon. He was dragged by wild horses, and literally torn into fragments. And one of the most interesting passages in the early Christian poetry, is that which describes the tender and reverential care with which the faithful gathered together these scattered relics, the devotion with which they honoured them, and the confidence with which they relied upon the intercession of the martyr. Prudentius himself does not hesitate to confess how much he owes to the intercession of Hippolytus:—

Mira loci pietas et prompta precantibus ara,
Spes hominum placida prosperitate juvat
Hic corruptelis animique et corporis aeger,
Oravi quoties stratus, opem merui.
Quod lætor reditu, quod te, venerande Sacerdos,†
Complecti licitum est, scribo quod hæc eadem,
Hippolyto scio me debere; Deus cui Christus
Posse dedit quod quis postulet annuere.‡

Among the different notices of the six personages thus enumerated in the martyrologies, there is not a word from which we could infer that any one of them was Hippolytus the writer. On the contrary, without entering into the question, (which Dr. Döllinger discusses very elaborately, and with all his familiar erudition) of the critical value of these various records, it is sufficiently plain that there are several of them, which could not by any possibility be understood of the writer of the *Philosophumena*. Putting out of view for the present the fact, that, whereas the writer of this

* Page 202; and again p. 222.

† Valerianus, bishop of Saragossa, to whom the hymn is addressed.

‡ Hymn. xi. vv. 175—80.

narrative must have been a bishop, there is not one of the martyrs here enumerated (except, possibly, the hero of Prudentius's Hymn) to whom this title could apply, it is plain, that, with the exception of the first, whose exile, in company with St. Pontianus, is recorded in the year 235, there is none whose martyrdom does not fall at a time which it would be difficult to reconcile with what is known of the age of Hippolytus the writer. He was a scholar of St. Irenæus, and therefore must have reached full age before the end of the second century; an inference which corresponds with what the author of the *Philosophumena* tells of himself in the ninth book, as taking a prominent part in the affairs of the Roman Church, in the very first years of the third century. Now of the dates of all the several martyrdoms referred to above, there is none earlier than the persecution of Valerian (A. D. 259), a period to which we cannot admit Hippolytus to have reached, without supposing him almost a centenarian.

But when we address ourselves *directly* to the question of the personality of Hippolytus the writer, the difficulties are even more embarrassing. Eusebius, St. Jerome, and Theodoret, as we have already seen, all speak of him as a bishop, but all were unable to discover of what see. Theodoret is the earliest author who alludes to him as a martyr. The modern authorities are full of endless perplexity. By some (as Gelasius, or the author of the book *De Duabus Naturis*) he is called bishop of Bostra in Arabia; by others bishop of Portus Romanus; (which some have understood of Portus, properly so called, others of Aden, in the Red Sea;) while the vast majority of those who refer to him at all, and among them Eustratius and Leontius, priests of Constantinople, in the sixth and seventh century, Anastasius Sinaita, Germanus of Constantinople, St. John of Damascus, Georgius Syncellus, Theophylact, a host of Greek *Catenæ Patrum*, and a number of martyrologies, Greek, Syriac, and Coptic, style him, "bishop (or 'archbishop') of Rome," "Roman bishop," and "bishop of old Rome;" and even enumerate him with other bishops of Rome, in such a way as to make it plain that they held him to have been, in the strict sense of the word, bishop of that see.*

* For example, Leontius Byzantinus *De Sectis*, p. 430, speaks of Κλήμης καὶ Ἰππόλυτος ἐπισκόποι Ρώμης.—*Clement and Hippolytus, bishops of Rome* [Cited in *Opp. Hipp.* l. ix. Fabricius's Edition.]

To add to these difficulties, already sufficiently complicated, Dr. Döllinger holds it to be quite certain that in the age of Hippolytus, Portus was not, and could not have been a bishop's see at all; and, although we do not think his argument on this point is perfectly conclusive, yet he has at least shown, beyond the possibility of dispute, that there is not a single authority for the fact of Hippolytus's having been bishop of Portus, earlier than the seventh century; and that, even at that period, the authors who refer to him as such are exclusively orientals, whose opportunities of accurate information as to such facts may naturally be presumed to have been unsatisfactory and imperfect. He shows, too, by the clearest evidence, that there is not the smallest shadow of probability for the assertion, (which is made with the utmost confidence by Chevalier Bunsen,) that Hippolytus, supposing him to have been bishop of Portus, one of the suburban sees of Rome, would, by the very fact, have been a member of the presbytery of Rome, and thus would have been officially entitled to take that part in its affairs, which the author of the *Philosophumena* plainly enacted.

Dr. Döllinger himself, therefore, seeing that the weight of testimony is in favour of Hippolytus's having been, in some way, bishop of Rome, and discovering in the language of the *Philosophumena*, very significant traces of the assumption of such a character, conceives that the difficulties of the conflicting opinions may be reconciled by supposing that Hippolytus, having pushed to its extreme length that resistance to Pope Callistus which is exhibited in the *Philosophumena*, was actually himself appointed by his own partisans, bishop of Rome, in opposition to Callistus; and thus that he enacted the same part which, some thirty years later, we find taken by Novatian, in circumstances very analogous to those which the *Philosophumena* details.

The schism of which this was the consummation, he thinks was so brief and unimportant, as not to have left any permanent trace in the meagre history of a time so troubled, and to have escaped notice in the West; whereas the Greek writers of a later date finding in the *Philosophumena* these supposed evidences of the writer's having been bishop of Rome, were induced, in ignorance of the true facts, to cite him under that title, by which, however, he is never called by any of the better-informed historians.

This conjecture is an exceedingly ingenious one, and is supported with all that erudition, of which Dr. Döllinger is unquestionably the most accomplished master of our age. But with all our respect for every opinion of such a scholar, we cannot bring ourselves to regard it as at all admissible.

In the first place we cannot regard the argument from the authority of the Greek writers, from the seventh century downwards, as entitled to much weight. Dr. Döllinger himself rejects, as too modern to be held decisive, the similar testimonies in favour of Portus, although the majority of these, being Latins, should be held to have better opportunities of information.

The arguments, too, from the language used by the writer of the *Philosophumena* ;—from his cautious abstinence from ever giving to Callistus the title of bishop, and his boast of having cast out of his communion [*ιφ' ημων ἐκβλήτοι γενομένοι τὴς ἐκκλήσιας*] persons who afterwards attached themselves to Callistus, which would seem to imply the exercise of episcopal authority in Rome itself ;—appear to us but vague and inconclusive, and may all be explained in the supposition of his having been bishop of some adjoining see, such as Portus.

But the great and, although purely negative, in our opinion, fatal, objection to this hypothesis, is the total silence of all history. We are aware that this is a difficulty which is, in some way, to be encountered in every supposition, and which, in truth, (as we have stated on a former occasion) appears to us an almost insoluble objection against the credibility of the narrative. But it is clear that it tells with tenfold force against Dr. Döllinger's hypothesis. We do not insist so much on the improbability of such a fact's escaping the notice of Eusebius, and, still more, that of St. Jerome, who, as secretary of Pope Damasus, had access to all the archives of the Church of Rome. But we look upon the silence of all the writers in the Novatian controversy, and those in the Rebaptism controversy, as perfectly decisive. Let it be borne in mind that in Dr. Döllinger's hypothesis, the case of Hippolytus, in relation to Callistus, would have been in every respect analogous to that of Novatian in reference to Cornelius ; that it would have furnished a complete precedent for the course taken by that schismatic ; that a large proportion of the flock of Cornelius must have been living in the pontificate of Cal-

listus, which was only thirty years earlier ; that it is absolutely impossible that the fact should not have been well known and remembered ; and that, being so remembered, it is even more impossible that it should not have been pressed into the controversy by the partisans of either side. Now, of all the transactions connected with Novatian's schism we have a tolerably full and detailed account, and that, not only on the side of Novatian, and on that of Cornelius, but also from parties not directly interested for either. And yet there is not, in all that has come down to us, a single word or even allusion, from which we could infer that any such event as the election of two rival bishops had ever occurred in the see of Rome until (in the favourite phrase of the partisans of Cornelius) the seamless garment had first been rent by the sacrilegious hand of Novatian. Assuredly Novatian himself, in that bold and unscrupulous letter which has been preserved in the Cyprianic Correspondence, would have appealed with triumph to such a distinguished precedent as that of a learned and eloquent writer like Hippolytus. Or if there were circumstances, (as, for instance, Hippolytus's having repented and returned from the schism,) which made the precedent an inconvenient one for Novatian, would it not, on that very ground, have been pressed into service by his rival Cornelius ? If it escaped both of these, would St. Cyprian or the clergy of Carthage, during the active correspondence which they maintained, have passed it over in silence ? Especially as, if we can believe the narrative of the Philosophumena, the question of re-baptizing had formed a part of the subject of dispute ?* We look upon this as absolutely incredible ;—not to speak at all of the fact, that Novatian has been universally regarded as the first of that ominous catalogue of anti-popes from whose ambition the later Church has had so much of scandal and abuse to suffer.

For these and other similar reasons we feel ourselves constrained, however diffidently, to withhold our assent from the view which Dr. Döllinger has put forward in this portion of his essay.† And, even while we do so, we candidly confess ourselves unable to offer any definitive solution

* *Ἐπι τούτου πρωτῶς τετολμῆται δευτέρου αὐτοῖς βαπτισμα.* Philosoph. 391. [“In his time they first dared to administer a second baptism.”]

† Chapter 3, sect. vi. pp. 100—4.

of this obscure and difficult question. Among the various martyrs of the name Hippolytus, however, who present themselves for consideration, there is none, we conceive, whose history may better be reconciled with what the author of the *Philosophumena* tells of himself, than that of the hero of Prudentius's Hymn. And although we agree with Dr. Döllinger, that from its poetical form, and from the highly poetical colouring which pervades the description of the martyrdom, it would be unsafe to accept this hymn, in all its parts, as a historical authority, yet we feel very strongly that, of all the narratives regarding Hippolytus which we have, it is the one most entitled to credit. It is the only one, perhaps, of whose age we have a perfect certainty; and although part of it may probably be a pure poetical *fiction* ;—as, for instance, the manner of the martyr's death, (which very likely was suggested by the tradition about the companion of St. Laurence the Deacon, or perhaps even by the analogy of name with that of the son of Theseus, the hero of the classical story,) yet, in the main features, it tallies perfectly with what we believe to be, substantially, the real history of Hippolytus the writer, especially supposing him to be the author of the *Philosophumena*.

We have detailed in a former number our reasons for believing that the author of that treatise was an adherent of the schism of Novatian, or at least of some party in the Roman Church which maintained principles, both of doctrine and practice, analogous to those which formed the ground of that schism. It is unnecessary to repeat these arguments here; but we look upon them as entirely inexplicable, except on one or other of these suppositions. Since we last wrote, everything which we have read upon the subject has confirmed us in the general conclusion; and we have seen many reasons to prefer the latter of these hypotheses, viz., that the schismatical or anti-papal party to which this writer belonged, was not the actual party of Novatian, but that, although many years prior to Novatian, it embodied or anticipated all his leading principles and practices. Now, beyond all question, this goes to confirm, at least in a general way, the main fact in the narrative of Prudentius, namely, the Novatian opinions at one time professed by his hero. The same fact, again, draws further confirmation from the tradition regarding the Novatian priest who suffered martyrdom at Antioch; and although this tradition cannot claim a very high

antiquity, or rather, although it seems plain that it is but an echo of the western one, yet it must be held to supply a confirmation of the truth of its original.

In like manner, the place of the martyrdom in Prudentius's narrative receives confirmation, not only from the narrative of the *Philosophumena*, which clearly came from one resident in or near Rome, but also from the various testimonies to the fact of Hippolytus's having been bishop of Portus; for, as we have already observed, there is no difficulty whatever in understanding Prudentius to have used *presbyterum* in that extended sense; and, in point of fact, he calls Valerian bishop of Saragossa, to whom the Hymn is addressed, by the equally equivocal name *sacerdos*.

It is true that this opinion is open to the same difficulty, viz. that drawn from the silence of all the contemporary writers, or those who lived near the time of Callistus, and especially of Novatian and his opponents. But it is much less so than the hypothesis of an actual antipope; and if we suppose the contest to have been a brief one, and Hippolytus's return to the Church to have occurred at the death of Callistus (222), it will perhaps, not be deemed extraordinary, either that it should have attracted but little notice at the time, or that the memory of a mere internal feud should have practically been forgotten, in the midst of the many storms from without by which the Church of Rome had been assailed in the eventful period which intervened before the appearance of Novatian.

We may add, that Dr. Gieseler, a critic whom it is impossible to suspect of a tendency to receive too easily a suspicious or apocryphal narrative, declares most unhesitatingly, that "there can be no doubt that this is the martyr referred to in Prudentius's Hymn;"* and throughout his entire essay on the subject, speaks of the history contained in this Hymn, not only as admissible, but as true. His own conjecture is that Hippolytus was sent by Novatian, as an ambassador to the Eastern Churches, in order to procure their sanction for him in his contest with Cornelius; and that he is no other than the Hippolytus mentioned by Eusebius† as the bearer of a letter "στόλη

* *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 777.

† *Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 46. I. p. 202.

διακόνικη] from Dionysius of Alexandria, "to the brethren at Rome."* This is a conjecture, however, which is open, not only to all the difficulties enumerated above, but to many others beside.

Without, however, pursuing these discussions farther, the little that we have said upon this and the other kindred topics regarding the authorship of the *Philosophumena*, may serve to show how very questionable must be every conclusion which is founded upon any one of the hypotheses as yet put forward upon the subject. It is not clearly proved, either (1) that the author was Hippolytus; or (2) that it was *Saint Hippolytus*; or (3) that at the time when he wrote it he was reputed a saint, (or in truth a member of the orthodox communion at all); or lastly, that his reputation for sanctity and the veneration into which his memory has been received, are not attributable to the very fact of *his actually abandoning* the party in whose interest the ninth book of the *Philosophumena* was written, of his retracting those principles of opposition to the bishop of Rome which are there expressed, and, in the words of Nicephorus Callisti, wiping away and obliterating "the stain of his ignorance by the martyrdom which he bore for the name of Christ."†

But there is another view of the narrative regarding Callistus contained in the *Philosophumena*, which has been completely overlooked by the body of Protestant critics, in their overweening anxiety to employ it as a weapon of offence against Rome. It has never occurred to them to examine the whole narrative calmly and dispassionately, with a view to ascertain the precise nature of the charges which are there made against Callistus, to test their intrinsic evidences of justice and of credibility, and, by the ordinary rules of criticism, to form an impartial judgment, both as to the amount of credence which they deserve, and as to the legitimate conclusions to be deduced from them, as affecting the moral character and the doctrinal orthodoxy of the Pontiff against whom they are levelled. M. Bunsen accepts them all in their widest and most sweeping import; without abating one jot on the score of the heat or violence, which are inseparable, one would suppose, from that undisguised partisanship which they exhibit.

* *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 774.

† *Niceph. Hist. Eccles. Lib. iv. cap. xxxi. p. 221.*

"I know very well that Hippolytus has not treated Callistus much more courteously than Luther did Henry VIII.; and I think there is in Hippolytus's controversy against Callistus the appearance of the odium theologicum, and personal bitterness and irritation, which is certainly not conformable with the ideal of a 'perfect Christian temper.' But what has that, after all, to do with his truth and with his fact? It must make the historian cautious not to take his judgment in this matter as unbiassed and impartial; but it is mere sentimentality or hypocrisy to determine by this standard the judgment upon the great question at issue. And this I conceive simply to be,—whether the man was good and honest (humanly speaking), or a fool and rogue. No man is both; and every historical character is either the one or the other. I do not know what are the ingredients in a canonized martyr, a sainted ecclesiastical writer, and bishop. But I confess that, if moral indignation against wickedness and falsehood is not one, I must look for bright patterns of what is good and great among classical heathens or common Christians. As to my own taste, I prefer good, strong indignation infinitely to an impotent indifference, and to mawkish hypocrisy. The man who will not attack a falsehood will not defend truth; and he who dares not call a knave a knave (whether he be his bishop or brother bishop or not), will not treat tyranny as tyranny, when the cause of Christian truth is attacked by force. Yet it was for this that the martyrs died, from Hippolytus to Ridley. Nor do I see how any man can speak too strongly, when he is defending truth against wickedness. This was not the view of the middle ages: Thomas Aquinas was not deemed less wise or less holy by Dante and other of his worshippers, for having intimated clearly enough what he thought of tyrants like Charles of Anjou.

"'But he ought not to have been so personal against Callistus.'—'And how do you know,' I should answer to such an assertion, 'that it was personal feeling, personal bitterness, personal obstinacy, that made Hippolytus so indignant? and that it was not the love of truth, and of his own Church, and of the Christian people, that made him write the ecclesiastical memoirs of the Roman presbytery of the time?' Respect for authority is something; but respect for truth is more. So rates (to judge from similar expressions of his) would not have thought that Hippolytus possessed the highest Attic grace in exposing the wickedness of Callistus; but he might have said that, for a man imbued with Judaic barbarism, he expressed himself tolerably well, and that, on the whole, he gave him the impression of a God-fearing man, wishing to do good to his fellow-believers and fellow-men."—Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, pp. 323—325.

In one word, M. Bunsen's view of the contest between these parties, is based upon the fixed principle that the papacy was wrong, and that every opponent of the papacy

had right and justice on his side. Surely it would have been more reasonable, as well as more in accordance with sound criticism, to admit the possibility that truth (if he could not bring himself to believe it all on the side of Callistus,) might, at least, lie between the extremes. Good sense, as well as good criticism, might have suggested a suspicion that an angry man, as the author of the *Philosophumena* clearly was, may possibly not have had *all* the truth on his side; and might have roused much more than a suspicion that, even supposing him to have been right in the main, he may not have been tempted, in his anger, beyond the exact limit of the truth which he really had in his favour. How differently does M. Bunsen judge, how widely different the spirit of his criticism, where the balance of *prima facie* evidence inclines in the opposite direction!

Dr. Wordsworth makes somewhat greater show of moderation; but in truth his anti-papal bias is equally apparent in the end. As regards the actual charges against Callistus and his government, put forward by the author of the *Philosophumena*, he takes the seemingly unexceptionable course of referring the reader to the original passage, which, together with a literal translation, is appended to his essay. Nay, he even entertains the question whether there be not in the narrative sufficient evidence of heat and exaggeration to induce a suspicion of its being exaggerated. He even admits that "there is doubtless a *tendency* to Novatianism in this portion of the work." (p. 102.) But with his eyes open to this tendency, and with all the reasons for suspicion clearly before him, he does not hesitate to pronounce that "it is not easy to say why an author who writes like the author of the *Philosophumena*, (and who appears to be no other than St. Hippolytus, a Bishop and Doctor of the Church), should be accused of misrepresentation" (p. 101), and even to adopt fully and unreservedly, all his statements regarding the condition of the Church in his time! "If," he writes, "we reflect on the religious state of the Roman Church as displayed in this volume, if we recollect the painful provocations which *such disciplinarian laxity and heretical gravity* as he describes rarely fail to minister to *pious minds*, and if we remember that *we*, living in the nineteenth century, have seen the results of reactions in the opposite direction, but that *he* lived and wrote *before* the rise of Novatianism, we shall not judge

our Author from our own circumstances, but shall endeavour to place ourselves in his age and country, and shall attribute his vehement language against laxity of discipline to his *zeal for the holiness and purity of the Spouse and Body of Christ.*"

So that, in Dr. Wordsworth's view, the author of the *Philosophumena* is to be the judge, not only in the cause of his adversaries, but even in his own. His own picture of "the religious state of the Roman Church" is to be accepted as the test and standard of truth! His, and his alone, is the "pious mind;" his adversaries, and especially the Roman Bishop, are the abettors of "disciplinarian laxity and heretical pravity!" What appears at first sight to be fierce invective or vulgar and scurrilous vituperation, is but "vehement language against laxity of discipline;" and what we, in our simplicity, have been regarding as personal acrimony and the vindictiveness of wounded pride, is but "zeal for the holiness and purity of the Spouse and Body of Christ."*

We should like to see Dr. Wordsworth's sincerity in the profession of these principles tested by being applied to a case in which his own party-opinions were interested. How would he receive such a criticism of Neal at the hands of a nonconformist? Or, to come nearer to the times under consideration, how indignantly would he scout an attempt on the part of an Arian, to set up the authority of some recovered fragment of Philostorgius, as alone sufficient to decide what was "the religious state of the Church" during the angry contests of Arianism and its kindred controversies!

Very different the spirit, and far more philosophical the method, adopted by Dr. Döllinger. He devotes a long and most learned chapter to this important branch of the subject;—not a string of empty declamations, or of vague and unpractical speculations, but a calm and detailed investigation, not only of each head of the accusation against Callistus, but of the entire question regarding the moral, social, and disciplinary condition of the Church of his age, in reference to each. We cannot help regarding this ex-

* We scarcely think it necessary to add that Mr Elfe Tayler's *Hippolytus and the Christian Church*, is an exact echo, faint, but bigoted, of M. Bunsen and Dr. Wordsworth in these particulars.

tremely interesting chapter* as one of the most successful efforts of Dr. Döllinger's genius, and the most signal monument of his profound and various erudition, and of the singularly upright and impartial character of his mind.

We could not hope to give in the compass of a few pages any adequate analysis of this most important chapter,—more important, perhaps, for its curious learning and the various and interesting information which it contains, than even for its bearing upon the case of Callistus. We must be content with a very summary notice of its general tenor.

And first, although in our former notice of the *Philosophumena* we transcribed from Chevalier Bunsen's pages his abstract of the scandalous history of Callistus contained in the ninth book of the *Philosophumena*, it will be more satisfactory to insert here so much of the actual text of the author as contains the main imputations upon the personal character of Callistus, and also on his government of the Church. We shall use Dr. Wordsworth's translation, which is sufficiently exact for our purpose.

The following is his sketch of the career of Callistus prior to his promotion to the Episcopate.

"He was servant of a certain Carpophorus, a Christian of Cæsar's household. Carpophorus entrusted him, as a Christian, with a considerable sum of money, professing that he would bring him gain from the occupation of a banker. He set up a bank in the *piscina publica*, and in course of time many deposits were entrusted to him by widows and brethren, through the influence of the name of Carpophorus. But Callistus embezzled them all, and became bankrupt. And when he was in this plight, tidings did not fail to reach Carpophorus, who said that he would call him to account. When Callistus perceived this, and apprehended the danger which threatened him from his master, he ran away, taking flight towards the sea; and having found a ship at Portus ready to sail, he embarked with a purpose to sail whithersoever the vessel might be bound. But not even thus could he escape: for the news did not fail to reach the ears of Carpophorus. And he, standing on the shore, endeavoured, according to the information he had received, to make for the ship, which was in the middle of the harbour. But when the boatman (who was to ferry Carpophorus) was lingering, Callistus, being in the ship, saw his master from a distance, and perceiving himself to be caught, hazarded his life, and, thinking that all was now over with him, he threw himself into the sea. But the

* *Hippolytus and Kallistus*, pp. 115—194.

sailors having leapt into the boats drew him out, against his will. And while those who were on the shore raised a great shout, he was delivered to his master and brought back to Rome ; where his master confined him in the pistrinum. In course of time, as is wont to be the case, certain brethren came to Carpophorus and besought him to release his runaway slave from punishment, saying that he declared that he had money vested in the hands of certain persons. Carpophorus, like a pious man, said that he did not care for his own money, but that he was anxious for the deposits ; for many bewailed themselves to him, saying that it was by reason of his name that they confided to Callistus what they had entrusted to him. Being thus persuaded, he ordered him to be released. But having nothing to pay, and not being able to run away again, on account of being watched, he devised a plan for his own destruction. On a Saturday, under pretence of going to his debtors, he went to the Synagogue of the Jews, who were assembled in it ; and he stood there and made an uproar against them. And they being thus disturbed abused him and beat him, and dragged him before Fuscianus, prefect of the city.

" And thus they said. ' The Romans have given us leave to read the Law of our Fathers in public. But this man here came in and interrupted us, saying that he is a Christian.' Fuscianus being seated on the bench, and being exasperated by what the Jews said against Callistus, tidings did not fail to come to the ears of Carpophorus. He hastened to the tribunal of the Prefect, and exclaimed, ' I entreat thee, my Lord Fuscianus, do not believe him, for he is not a Christian, but seeks an occasion of death, having embezzled much money of mine, as I will show.' But the Jews thought this was a subterfuge, as if Carpophorus desired to extricate him by this plea, and clamoured more vehemently in the ears of the Prefect. And he, being urged by them, scourged Callistus, and sentenced him to the mines in Sardinia.

" But after a time, there being other Martyrs there, Marcia, the Concubine of (the Emperor) Commodus, being a religious woman, and desirous of doing a good work, having sent for Victor, of blessed memory, who was then Bishop of the Church, enquired of him what martyrs were in Sardinia. He presented all their names, but did not tender the name of Callistus, knowing the crimes that had been perpetrated by him. Marcia having obtained her suit from Commodus, gives the letter of release to a certain Hyacinthus, an eunuch, a presbyter, who having received it, sailed to Sardinia, and having delivered it to the Governor of the Island, released the martyrs,—except Callistus.

" But he fell down before him, and wept and prayed that he might be released. Hyacinthus being then moved, desires the Governor to set him free, saying that he himself had brought up Marcia, and promising him indemnity. He, being persuaded, liberated Callistus also. But when he reached Rome, Victor was much

distressed by what had taken place, but being a kind-hearted man, he held his peace ; but guarding against the obloquy from many, (for the crimes of Callistus were recent,) and because Carpophorus still urged his charge (against Callistus), he sent him to abide at Antium, settling on him a monthly allowance for his maintenance. After Victor had fallen asleep in death, Zephyrinus having had him (Callistus) as a coadjutor for the control of his Clergy, honoured him to his own damage, and, having transferred him from Antium, set him over the cemetery. And Callistus, being always with him, and, as I said before, courting him with hypocrisy, eclipsed him, being incapable of forming any judgment on the arguments used, and not perceiving the stratagem of Callistus, who accommodated all his language to his taste."—pp. 249—59.

Still more startling is his picture of Callistus's Episcopate.

" This deceiver having ventured to do such things, set up for himself a school against the Church, teaching these doctrines; and he was the first to devise also to gratify men in their lusts, saying that all men's sins were forgiven by himself. For if any one commits any sin who is a member of another man's congregation and is called a Christian, his sin (they say) is not imputed to him if he runs off to the School of Callistus. And many persons being delighted with this decree who were wounded in their consciences, and who had also been thrown off from many Heresies, and some cast out of the Church by me after judicial sentence, flocking to them, swelled his School.

" This man promulgated as a dogma, that if a Bishop should commit any sin, even if it were a sin unto death, he ought not to be deposed. In his time Bishops, Priests and Deacons, digamists and trigamists, began to be enrolled in the Clergy.

" And if any one being in the clerical body should marry (he determined) that such a person should remain in the Clergy as not having sinned, saying that the words of the Apostle were spoken with a view to him : ' Who art thou that judgest another man's servant ? ' (Rom. xiv. 4); and he said that the parable of the tares was spoken with reference to him : ' Let the tares grow together with the wheat' (Matt. xiii. 30), that is, let sinners remain in the Church. Besides, he said that the Ark of Noah was made for a figure of the Church, and that in it were dogs, and wolves, and ravens, and all clean things and unclean ; affirming that it must be so in the Church.

" As many passages for this purpose as he was able to collect he expounded in this manner ; and his disciples, being pleased with his doctrines, remain, deluding themselves and others, and crowds flock to their School.

" Hence they are thronged, vaunting their multitudes, on account of pleasures which Christ did not permit, and in despite of

Him they restrain from no sin, professing that they themselves forgive sins to those who acquiesce in them.

"For he also permitted women, if they had no husband, and were enamoured of a comrade unworthy of themselves, or did not wish to degrade their own dignity, therefore they might lawfully marry any one whom they chose as a consort, whether a slave or free, and that she who was not married to him lawfully might regard him in place of a husband.

"Thence it was that women, called believers, began to venture to bandage themselves with ligaments to produce abortion, and to deal with drugs in order to destroy what was conceived, because they did not like to have a child from a slave or a mean person, on account of their kindred, and haughtiness of wealth.

."Behold to what impiety this lawless person proceeded, teaching adultery and murder at the same time! And yet after all these enormities these men are lost to all sense of shame, and presume to call themselves a Catholic Church! And some persons imagining to fare well resort to them.

"In his time, first they dared to administer a second baptism."
--pp. 263—71.

The personal history of Callistus prior to his pontificate is of comparatively little importance, nor do we mean to dwell at much length upon it. But the writer's allegations regarding it are valuable, as supplying a key to the general character of his strictures, where these may involve more serious consequences. We must say a word or two upon it, therefore, in passing on. It cannot fail to strike even the most cursory reader that there is a degree of recklessness in some of these imputations which it is impossible to regard as other than unscrupulous. It is plain that it is not enough for this writer to state facts. He never fails to put his own construction upon them; and that construction not only is invariably unfavourable to Callistus, but it is more than once entirely gratuitous, and even irreconcileable with the facts told in connexion with it. It is not enough, for instance, to tell that Callistus became bankrupt. This is a public event, which might occur either through the accidents of trade, such as the defalcation of the party's own debtors, or the failure of speculations, just as well as through the fraud and dishonesty of the bankrupt. Does Callistus receive the benefit of this doubt? Far from it. He was "a cheat" and "a swindler." He "embezzled the money." And this, not only without allegation of proof, but even in the face of strong doubts suggested by the facts which the writer himself details. For it appears

even from what he incidentally drops, that Callistus was himself a sufferer from the defalcation of others; and that, even when he returned to Rome, he still had debtors (*χρεωτας*, p. 252.) from whom he continued to solicit payment, and to whose failure, very probably, his own bankruptcy might be ascribed. So again, when, after his flight from Rome, he was overtaken on board ship at Portus by his master, and threw himself into the sea, he may have done so with the intention of swimming to shore or otherwise making his escape. Indeed, this is the most natural and probable explanation of the proceeding. But this would be too merciful an interpretation for the author of the *Philosophumena*, and he undertakes to read the secrets of his heart, and to decide that his object was *self-destruction*;—for this is the true meaning of the phrase, *ηφειδησε του ζην*, which Dr. Wordsworth translates “hazarded his life.” (p. 251.)

The same recklessness in imputing motives pervades the entire narrative. Thus he construes Callistus’s intrusion into the synagogue, and his perhaps ostentatious, perhaps fanatical, attempt to interrupt its proceedings, into another deliberate design to put an end to his life, *τέχνην θαντον ἐπενοήσε*; rather a clumsy and round-about plan, one would think, of effecting what could have been done so much more directly, or which, even in the course which he selected, had he seriously desired it, would have been far more efficaciously secured, by his selecting a pagan temple, rather than a Jewish synagogue, as the scene of his self-sought martyrdom. Thus, again, he represents Pope Victor as highly incensed against Callistus, and greatly distressed at his release from his exile in Sardinia, whereas in the next line he falls into the manifest inconsistency of recording that he undertook to provide for him, sent him to Antium, and settled on him “a monthly allowance for his maintenance!”

But the most palpable absurdity of all is the account which he gives of Callistus’s career under Zephyrinus. It must be borne in mind that he represents Zephyrinus as an ignorant man, and a corrupt bishop, *άνδρας ἴδωτον καὶ αὐχηρερδον*, p. 228.] He describes Callistus as having, during the pontificate of this (corrupt) ruler, acted as his flatterer and his toady, and risen, by these base acts, to be “his coadjutor, in the control of his clergy.” We need hardly remind our readers that the tool of an unpopular

government never fails to fall in for a full share of the unpopularity, and particularly that the compliant minister of "dirty work," such as what, by implication, is here ascribed to Callistus, is sure to be more detested than the power which employs him. And yet in the very same breath in which this is told of Callistus, we are informed, that, upon the death of Zephyrinus,—at a time, be it remembered, when episcopal election rested exclusively with the clergy and the people—the unprincipled adventurer, the dishonoured bankrupt, the twice-baffled suicide, above all, the mean, fawning, yet tyrannical huck of the corrupt bishop from whom they had just been released by death, was selected to fill the same place, by the very clergy who had long smarted under his control, and the people who, for eighteen years, had been the witnesses, or rather the victims, of his corruption!

We might pursue to still more lengthened detail the inconsistencies and improbabilities of the singularly intemperate portion of the narrative which regards the career of Callistus before "he had gained that to which he had aspired." But we must pass on to the picture which the writer draws of the condition of the Church, moral and disciplinary, such as it became under his government, and, as he broadly asserts, through his guilty instrumentality.

The charges which he prefers against the ecclesiastical rule of Callistus are eight in number:—

I. That, for the purposes for his own guilty ambition, and in order to attract followers to his "school," or "conventicle,"—διδισκαλέιον—(as it is contemptuously called) he pandered to the passions and lusts of men, by professing to remit all men's sins.

II. That, with the same view, he held forth to members of any other communion, who had fallen into sin, a pledge that if they attached themselves to his school, their sin would not be imputed to them.

III. That he laid it down, if a bishop were guilty of sin, even though it were unto death, nevertheless he must not be deposed.

IV. That under him was introduced the practice of admitting bigamists and trigamists into the clergy.

V. That he sanctioned the practice of permitting a man who contracted marriage while in the clerical ranks, to remain therein, as though he had not been guilty of any fault.

VI. That he permitted women of rank to take paramours of low degree, whether slaves or free men, and to repute these as their husbands, though not legally married to them.

VII. That, through his means, and even by his teaching, [διδασκαλία] arose the abominable practice of procuring abortion, and preventing the birth of the fruit of these dishonouring connexions.

VIII. That in his time the practice of re-baptizing was first introduced.*

We deeply regret that the necessity of space must limit us to the most brief and meagre outline of Dr. Döllinger's most luminous disquisition upon these motley heads of accusation. Never have the extent and variety of his erudition appeared to greater advantage.

We shall pass them successively in review.

I. As to the first charge of having professed to forgive all sins without distinction, and having sought by this indulgence to swell the number of his followers, Dr. Döllinger admits the fact that Zephyrinus and Callistus persisted in, and probably extended the more indulgent system of Church discipline on the subject of penance, which had begun towards the close of the second century, and which formed the subject of the worst strictures of the Montanist party, and of Tertullian, in those of his writings which fall within his Montanist period. But

1. The very tone in which the charge is made in the *Philosophumena*, is the clearest proof of the recklessness, if not of the bad faith of the author. What evidence has he, or by what possible process of enquiry *could he have* ascertained, that the motive by which Callistus was influenced in adopting this system, was that of extending his influence, and swelling the ranks of his party? May we not learn from the reckless confidence with which this charge, of the truth of which (as implying a knowledge of the secrets of his heart) he could not possibly have had any knowledge, to doubt his other unsustained assertions, even in cases where he may appear to have had opportunities of knowledge?

2. Dr. Döllinger makes it plain that the milder discipline introduced about this time at Rome, began before the time of Callistus, and that it was not peculiar to Rome,

* See *Philosophumena*, pp. 290—1.

but had been acted on long before in other churches, and especially in the East. Dionysius of Corinth, a contemporary of Pope Soter, (A. D. 169,) is recorded by Eusebius,* as having acted up to it in the widest extent.

3. The charge is, in itself, a gross exaggeration. The new discipline did not consist, as the language of the *Philosophumena* would convey, in admitting every sinner to Church-communion *without penance*, but in relaxing the old rigorous practice, by which certain grievous transgressions, as idolatry, murder, and adultery, were punished by *perpetual and hopeless exclusion from communion, even after canonical penance*.

4. We need scarcely add, that, as the milder discipline of Callistus prevailed, and received the sanction of the wisdom of universal Christendom, this imputation, at least, far from being a blot upon his memory, is the best tribute to his orthodoxy and to his correct appreciation of the true spirit of the Christian Church. One thing, at least, is certain, that if there be any body of Christians whose sympathies, in this particular, should naturally be with the stern and ruthless disciplinarian of the *Philosophumena*, it cannot be that school which has excluded the penitential system altogether from their code of church discipline.

II. There are equally palpable evidences of heat, exaggeration, and even misrepresentation in the charge of inviting sinners from other communions to attach themselves to his school, under the promise that their sins should not be imputed to them.

The practice of the Church in receiving heretics or schismatics had commonly discriminated between two classes;—those who had been born in heresy, and those who had fallen away into heresy from the communion of the Church. With regard to the former, the discipline had been more indulgent; but the latter, as apostates, had been dealt with according to the rigid principles. The charge against Callistus is not sufficiently specific to enable us to say in what precisely his alleged relaxation consisted; but from the writer's angry and impatient allusion to Callistus's admitting back some whom he had himself cast out of the Church, it would appear that Callistus's crime

* Eccles. Hist. iv. 23, I. I. p. 117. [Ed. Vales.] It extends to all degrees of criminality, *τας ἐξ ὅλας δ' ὅνν παπτωσεως. E qualicunque lapsu.*

consisted in his overlooking the distinction of practice just explained, and extending a more indulgent discipline to repentant sinners, who sought reconciliation after heresy, not only when they had *born in that heresy*, but even where they had *apostatized from the Church*. If any one shall say that this indulgence, especially in times of difficulty, such as we know those of Callistus to have been in Rome, was a crime on the part of the ecclesiastical ruler, we must say that we do not envy him his views upon the subject of church government.

III. The accusation as to Callistus's having relaxed the discipline regarding bishops, and enacting that "even if a bishop be guilty of a sin unto death, he need not be deposed," is in precisely the same spirit. Like all the other charges, the facts need but to be stript of their high colouring, in order to divest them of even the shadow of a reasonable ground of complaint. Dr. Döllinger, in a brief but most simple and luminous resumé of the history of the primitive discipline, shows that Callistus's legislation with regard to bishops, was only a necessary adjunct of the general pestilential system which had then come into use. The author of the *Philosophumena* does not explain what the "sin unto death," [$\pi\tau\delta\sigma\theta\alpha\tau\sigma\tau\omega$,] means in his moral category. But, as there had been a certain analogy between the earlier discipline in use with regard to the laity and that observed towards the clergy; and as the crimes which, by the earlier rule, were visited in the laity with perpetual exclusion from communion, had, by the same rule, entailed upon the higher clergy perpetual deposition from their ecclesiastical office, it naturally followed, from the relaxation of the first part, that the second also should receive an analogous relaxation. Hence, by the new discipline, the punishment of *perpetual deprivation* [$\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega$] was, in the same class of cases, abolished for the bishop. But this reckless and excited writer leaves it to be inferred, that the sin of the bishop was screened altogether from punishment by the corrupt code of Callistus; the truth being, that the new discipline in this particular consisted simply in the substitution, instead of the *perpetual deprivation* or deposition, [$\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\tau\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega$,] the milder, but yet sufficiently severe and humiliating, punishment of *temporary deprivation* or suspension [$\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\tau\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega$.]

IV. For the crime of admitting bigamists or trigamists

to the order of deacon, priest, and even bishop, Callistus is not made directly responsible. Reckless as the declamation is, it stops short of this.

(1) The only imputation on Callistus in this particular is, that the practice began in his time [*επι τούτον.*] He is not alleged to have originated or sanctioned the practice.

(2) Nevertheless, even here, there is the same evidence of the habit of loose and reckless assertion. It would be contrary to all the testimony of history to assert that, in the literal meaning of the words, this practice of admitting persons twice, or even three times married to the higher orders, ever was sanctioned, or even was in use, in the Roman Church. But there are some indications of an exceptional practice in particular churches, which most likely gave colour to the sweeping assertion of the *Philosophumena*. A distinction was made, in some churches, between the cases of bigamists who had been married twice *while still pagans*, (or even once before their conversion to Christianity, and a second time after their admission into the Church,) and that of *Christian bigamists*, strictly so called. In those churches, the rule of exclusion was confined to the latter, and the former class were (especially where eligible candidates for the ministry were few) admitted to holy orders. It is most probably to this departure from the strict Apostolic law that the allusion is made.

(3) But whatever may be the precise nature or extent of the allegation, it is clear that it does not directly affect either Callistus personally, or the party in the Roman Church of which he was the head; else we should have had this fact explicitly stated and made the subject of direct impeachment.

V. The vagueness of the fifth allegation is even more serious, and might lead to a more important misconception.

(1) It might easily be supposed that when the author charges Callistus with permitting "members of the clerical body who should marry (after ordination) to remain in the clergy as not having sinned" (p. 267), he alludes indiscriminately to every rank of the clergy, from the lowest to the highest; and thus taxes Callistus with permitting bishops, priests, and deacons, not only to retain the wives whom they had married before ordination, but even to contract marriage subsequent to that event. This, however, would

be a grievous misapprehension. There is a wide distinction in the language of the early Church between the *ἱερατικοὶ* and the *ἱερηρικοὶ*. The writer himself plainly marks the distinction. In the last charge we have seen that he speaks by name of bishops, priests, and deacons. In this, he uses the vague phrase *ἐν κλήρῳ ὡν*, which comprises the inferior grades of subdeacon, lector, acolyte, &c.

(2) It would be contrary to the admitted evidence of all early history to understand this charge as referring to the higher orders. Every critic, protestant as well as catholic, knows, that there is no precedent in the early discipline for the usage of permitting to the higher clergy to contract marriage after ordination.

(3) Even with regard to the lower grades, the practice of some churches, as we learn from the 13th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon,* forbade marriage after orders. For subdeacons the discipline was very various at different times and in different churches. Probably our rigorist author would have extended the rule to all, and inveighs against the milder discipline tolerated by Callistus.

(4) And yet the extent of his charge is, that clerics offending in this particular were permitted to remain *in the clerical body μενεών εν τῷ κληρῷ*. He does not say that they were permitted to officiate; and every student of Christian antiquities knows what a wide distinction exists between the *ἐν κληρῷ* and the *ἐν ὑπηρεσίᾳ*.

(5) But *whatever* we hold to have been the relaxation introduced by Callistus, every protestant critic must admit that, in this particular at least, the balance of justice and of reason, as well as of sound Christian policy, was in his favour, and against his (on this head at least) fanatical assailants.

VI. It is in the discussion of this charge, more than any of the others, that the singularly minute and ready erudition of Dr. Döllinger is most discernible. Nor could there possibly be a more signal exhibition of intemperance and recklessness in the fabrication of grounds of accusation against an antagonist than he establishes on this head against the writer of the *Philosophumena*.

The charge is, that Callistus, in the words of Dr. Words-

* Dr. Döllinger, (p. 152) says the 14th, but this is a mistake. See Harduini Coll. Conciliorum, i. 607.

worth's translation,* "permitted women, if they had no husband, and were enamoured of a comrade unworthy of themselves, or did not wish to degrade their own dignity, therefore they might lawfully marry any one whom they chose as a consort, whether a slave or free, and that she who was not married to him lawfully might regard him as a husband."† The natural import of this accusation is, that Callistus permitted, or at least tolerated, the practice of concubinage in women of rank. It is in this sense, and in the very worst construction of which it is susceptible, both as to the fact and as to the motive, that Chevalier Bunsen understands it (stigmatizing Callistus as the Tartuffe of his age, I. 134); nor does Dr. Wordsworth take the least exception to the accusation as it stands in the narrative, and in the fullest and broadest acceptation which it can there admit.

Now what is the truth as to that practice of Callistus, which is here made the object of such bitter and malignant satire? Will the reader believe that, fairly and dispassionately considered, both in relation to the Roman law of marriage, and in relation to the social condition of the Christian population of the Roman empire, the course which is here impeached, and which is made the ground of imputations so monstrous and so abominable, was in reality the course which every principle of Christian virtue

* The text as it stands is plainly corrupt, and both the original editor and his critics, M. Bunsen and Dr. Wordsworth, suggest emendations. None of these is satisfactory; but Dr. Döllinger has suggested an extremely simple and natural one, which removes all obscurity. The text is, *καὶ γάρ καὶ γυναιξὶν ἐπετρέψεν, εἰ ἀνανδροὶ εἰεν καὶ ἡλικιαὶ τε τε καιούντα ἐναξια, η ἔαυτων αξιαν ἦν μη βουλούντο καθάρειν, Διὰ τούτο νόμιμως γαμηθῆναι.* This is plainly unintelligible. Without noticing the earlier emendations, which are forced and unsatisfactory, we give Dr. Döllinger's, which is perfectly simple. *Καὶ γάρ καὶ γυναιξὶν ἐπετρέψεν, εἰ ἀνανδροὶ εἰεν, καὶ ἡλικιαὶ καιούνται (ορ καιούντο) αναξια την ἔαυτων αξιαν ἦν μη βουλούντο καθάρειν, διὰ τούτο νόμιμως γαμηθῆναι, κ. τ. λ.* "For to women, if they were unmarried, and still burned with the passions of youth, he permitted, if they did not wish to lose their rank, the unworthy indulgence, [επετρέψεν ἀναξια "he permitted unworthy things"] that, on this account, (or for this purpose) they might lawfully marry," &c.

We have seldom met a happier conjectural emendation, of so obscure a passage.

† P. 267.

every motive of Christian prudence, and every impulse of Christian morality, conspired to sanction and even to demand.

It would be a grievous mistake to apply to the marriage-question in the days of Callistus the same notions which would be applicable now. The law of marriage in Rome at that day, and especially in reference to the very marriages to which this abominable imputation refers, was altogether anomalous. The reader must perceive that the connexions to which it refers are those formed by *women of rank* [*γυναιξιν ευντων ἀξιαν ην μη βούλοντο καθαιρειν*] with *men of inferior degree, whether slaves or freemen*. [*ειτε ὄκετην ειτε ελεύθερον*.] Now by the Julian and the Papian laws, the marriage of the daughter of a senatorial family with a slave, or indeed with any one below the senatorial rank, was utterly forbidden, and was held to be mere concubinage. And this is clearly the import of the equivoval phrase, *μη νομῳ γεγαμησένην*, as well as of the coarse epithet, *συγκοιτην* (paramour) with which the writer stigmatizes the partner selected by the lady. And nevertheless, although such a connexion was in the eye of the Roman law reputed a mere cohabitation, yet it was not forbidden under penalty, but rather winked at; and was even protected by certain provisions in favour of the children who were born therein; so that there is abundant evidence both of the frequency of the practice, and of the indulgence with which it was regarded. These laws pressed with peculiar severity upon the poorer families of rank, whose daughters, finding it difficult to obtain husbands of their own class, were either compelled to observe a constrained, and in Rome most ungrateful, celibacy, or to resort to this semilegalized concubinage. We need hardly add, that, since, at the time of Callistus the Church numbered but few *men of rank*, although it is well known that *female* converts among the senatorial houses had been frequent ever since the days of St. Paul, the operation of the law in their regard was felt by the Christian families almost as an every-day grievance.

Now what was the proceeding of Callistus? Simply to *legalize in the eye of the Church*, those connexions which the law of Pagan Rome disallowed in its letter, but which, nevertheless, its spirit tolerated, if it did not actually sanction; and thus to remove, for the members of his own flock, the necessity of either practising celibacy reluctantly and

under many difficulties, or of resorting to an expedient which every principle of Christian morality repudiated and condemned. The stern and impracticable rigour of the *Philosophumena*, no doubt, would, as Tertullian had done, have ignored all consideration for the weakness of age, of sex, and of condition. It would have required of all indiscriminately to practise continency, whether specially called thereto or not ; and, with the unyielding harshness of Tertullian and his Montanist allies, would have rather added to, than lightened, the burdens of those who in their weakness solicited relief. But Callistus, with the hereditary Catholic instinct, caught, boldly but wisely, at the true medium ; and tenderly consulted, on the one hand, for the weakness of the women of his flock, and for the temptation to which the very humbleness of the social condition of the Christian youth peculiarly exposed them, and on the other, for the sanctity of marriage, and the maintenance and the honour of morality itself.

When one considers these circumstances, and weighs dispassionately the very terms of the attack on Callistus, even as it stands in the *Philosophumena*, it is hard to acquit the writer, we will not say of exaggeration and intemperance, but even of bad faith, and of conscious and deliberate misrepresentation.

VII. It is still more so as to the atrocious imputation which follows, viz., that Callistus, by the system which he adopted in reference to the connexions just referred to, encouraged and sanctioned the abominable practices of abortion and child-murder, thus, to use the writer's own words, "teaching adultery and murder at the same time." (p. 269.)

It is a subject into which, naturally, we are unwilling to enter. But one or two observations will be sufficient to show the monstrous injustice of this strangely blind or reckless accuser.

(1) He represents these abominable practices as having commenced at this time, as though they had been unknown and unheard of before. Unfortunately no one, even imperfectly acquainted with any of the Roman satirists, Juvenal, Persius, or Martial, can be ignorant of the universality and notoriety of these abominations in Rome. In Christian literature, no reader of Tertullian can shut

his eyes to the fact that they were only too notorious in his day.

(2) He charges Callistus with having, by his indulgence in legalizing these connexions, given an impulse to the practices already alluded to, as a means of concealing the shame of the frail ones who had recourse to what he considers an unworthy expedient of incontinence. Now, can any one fail to see the manifest injustice of such a representation? The fact is, that the proceeding adopted by Callistus was in its own nature, as well as in the peculiar circumstances of the times, *directly calculated to produce the very opposite result*. What had Callistus done? Simply to legalize in the eyes of the Church, and to invest with the sanctity of marriage, "honourable in all," connexions which the pagan law tolerated in point of fact, but held disreputable and dishonourable in point of right. Will any man say that the effect of this procedure was to supply an incentive to the hideous crime of child-murder? Was it not rather directly the contrary? Did it not, as far as Christians were concerned, (and for Christians public opinion lay among their own fellow-believers) remove the dishonour, as well as the sinfulness, of such connexions? Did it not, therefore, destroy at once the necessity and the temptation for concealment? Did it not legitimize the offspring, and invest the parents with all the honours and all the privileges of Christian marriage? And is it not the extreme of blindness to ascribe to it, by any possible combination of circumstances or of causes, the effect which the *Philosophumena* makes the ground of so much angry and revolting declamation?

VIII. We shall dismiss very briefly, having already outrun our allotted space, the eighth charge; namely, that it was under Callistus they first ventured upon a second baptism.

1. This is not directly charged on Callistus himself. It is merely stated to have originated in his time, [*επι τοιν τοιν*.] We may well believe that if it could have been brought home to him more nearly, a writer who is such a master of attack would not have failed to do so.

2. This is plainly an allusion to the re-baptizing of persons who joined the Church from some heretical common reason; but there is no statement as to whether the baptism administered in that heretical communion had been valid as to matter and form. If not, the re-baptism would

have been strictly in accordance with Catholic principle and Catholic practice.

3. It is, we think, manifest that in whatever sense we understand the writer to make the charge, it is historically impossible that Callistus could have given a sanction to that practice of re-baptizing heretics indiscriminately, which afterwards (only thirty or forty years later) was the ground of contest between SS. Cyprian and Stephen. If any such precedent could have been alleged by Cyprian or Firmilian, they would not have failed to bring it forward. Above all, were there any shadow of warrant for the charge, Stephen never could have dared this well-known appeal to antiquity: *Nihil innovetur, nisi quod traditum est.*

And here we must take our leave of this angry and sophistical disclaimer. On the whole, however, we feel ourselves fully warranted in saying that brief and cursory as, from the very necessities of space, has been our dissection of this tirade against Callistus, which the purveyors for the anti-papal market have so eagerly received almost as a new revelation, we have proved it to be a tissue of exaggeration, fallacy, misrepresentation, and self-delusion.

We wish our space would permit us to submit to a similar scrutiny the charges of heretical teaching which are made by this writer, against Callistus with equal boldness and confidence. But, as we have already done so, at some length, in our former notice of the *Philosophumena*, we willingly spare our reader the further tedium of a disquisition on the theological terminology of the third century.

In conclusion, we shall briefly recapitulate the conclusions which we think a candid mind will draw in the present stage of this curious controversy.

First, although it is sufficiently probable that Hippolytus is the author of the *Philosophumena*, there are still wanting more than one important link in the chain of evidences on which his claim to authorship depends.

Secondly. Admitting the author of the *Philosophumena* to be Hippolytus, it still remains unproved that he is any one of the personages of that name who have received the honour of saintship in the Church.

Thirdly. Even admitting the author of the *Philosophumena* to be *Saint Hippolytus*, it remains unproved that, in that period of his career in which it was written, he enjoyed the reputation of sanctity in the Church, and

even that he was not actually outside of her pale; nay further, it is, on the contrary, in the highest degree probable, that if the writer of the *Philosophumena* be St. Hippolytus at all, he is that St. Hippolytus to whom various traditions point as having been at one time a schismatic, but having returned to the Church, and "washed away the stain of schism in the blood of martyrdom."

Fourthly. Whoever and whatever the author of the *Philosophumena* may have been, the charges which he makes in the ninth book against Pope Callistus, are demonstrably exaggerated, inconsistent, sophistical, and false.

We respectfully submit each and all of these conclusions for Dr. Wordsworth's consideration, as not inapposite to his own over-hasty and uncritical deductions against the Papal Infallibility and Papal Supremacy from the "strange revelations" of this extraordinary book. If he refuse assent to the authority of Dr. Döllinger, on the ground of his Roman prepossessions, he may learn a useful lesson of candour and moderation from Dr. Gieseier;—a writer who is certainly beyond every suspicion of sympathy with Rome, but who has had the courage* to forget the sympathies and antipathies of the partisan, in the stern and uncompromising duty of a critic.

ART. VII.—*Demetrius the Impostor*, an Episode in Russian History.
By PROSPER MERIMEE, of the French Academy. Translated by
ANDREW R. SCOBLE. London: Bentley, 1853.

PAOLO GIOVIO opens the history of his own times with a sketch of those past times which were not too remote to influence them appreciably, and then reviews the leading politics of Europe, as they stood at the period to which he introduces us. In thus preparing us for his own particular subject, he has followed a precedent esta-

* See *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 770.

blished by Thucydides, confirmed by Sallust, and recommended by every consideration of good sense and convenience; for the general reader will require to reach such a subject by stages, and either is unable or does not care to fall upon it without notice or preparation. Indeed, call it as we may, there is no period of a nation's history, how episodic soever in appearance, that can be said to stand wholly unrelated to past and present, or that does not borrow light from both, and reflect it in return.

The learned bishop of Nuocera touches very slightly upon the foreign and domestic relations of the Muscovites; for Russia and the Russians were then unknown in Europe. But the fact that, so lately as the year 1494, they were entitled to no lengthier notice from a contemporary historian, will not sufficiently explain M. *Mérimée's* silence as to the centuries of authentic or nearly authentic Russian history, that precede the strangely eventful chapter which he has selected as his theme. No portion of Russian history was the peculiar concern of Giovio; nor had Russia, in 1494, as well by her diplomacy as by her arms, provoked the most anxious speculation on the part of European statesmen. She had not then lent her fatal aid to Poland, nor extended her ominous protection to Austria. She had not devoured one victim, nor lubricated the other. She had not staggered the power of Charles XII. and Napoleon, nor pushed her frontiers hundreds of miles forward in every direction. Napoleon had not yet prophesied that within a given time Europe would be republican or Cossack; nor had the policy of Russia pursued traditionally by a line of able princes, pointed with unvarying steadiness towards the realization of the latter alternative. She had not then overshadowed Europe with her bulk,

“Disastrous twilight shedding
On half the nations, and, with fear of change,
Perplexing monarchs.”

It could not, then, be said of Russia that “treaties were to her the scaffold by which she builds, and which she *knocks down* as she ascends,”* and, last of all, the balance of power had not become so sensitive in Europe, that the

* *Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South.* By David Urquhart. Introd. xxxii.

slightest preponderance of Russian influence might derange and destroy it for ever.

But apart from the temporary interest attaching at this moment to everything Russian, and treating the question as one of purely literary competency, it will hardly be denied that a few allusions to the reign of Ivan IV., are not a sufficient introduction to the history of Demetrius the Impostor, and that M. Mérimée seems to act on the presumption quite too flattering to the scholarship of his readers, that they are as deeply versed in Russian history as he no doubt is himself. It is to be feared, indeed, that for the want of some such introduction as we mention, M. Mérimée's picture of Russia in 1603, though sufficiently faithful and animated, will to most of us be absolutely without back-ground, and consequently seen to disadvantage. Past a doubt, the early history of Russia is of the dreariest description, and nearly altogether wanting in those dramatic incidents, those brilliant effects, those dashing exploits, and that delicate intrigue that captivate our attention, in the histories of other countries. The annals of Russia are tedious and repulsive, in the last degree, with scarce an incident to subdue our yawns, and but few landmarks to fix our recollection up to the time of this same Demetrius the Impostor; but for all that, a brief review of Russian history is quite indispensable to the formation of a correct opinion upon the series of revolutions connected with the title of M. Mérimée's work, and which are so intimately connected with the establishment of the present dynasty in Russia. The principal mistake to which the book, as it stands, seems likely to expose the unprepared reader, would lie in the supposition that Russian greatness is exclusively owing to the creative genius, as well as to the administrative talent of the Romanofs, and that Russian affairs were, and had been almost always, up to the time of their accession, a mere chaos, which their breath had reduced to order. A very slight acquaintance with Russian history will be sufficient to correct this impression, if any such exist; for Russia, though in a state of indescribable anarchy just before the election of Mikhaïl Romanof, had already worked out under hard masters, and in different schools, most of the problems in government which had previously, or have subsequently, received throughout Europe the like solution as in Russia. Thus we find the monarchy consolidated by the resumption of

provinces originally assigned as appanages to the princes of the blood ; the laws, such as they were, promulgated and codified ; the order of succession to the throne finally established, the power of the feudal nobility reduced, and other reforms accomplished, or attempted, under the first line of sovereigns ; then pursued by the able usurper, who played the mayor of the palace to the exhausted line of Rurik ; next, interrupted by the wars of the Demetrii ; and lastly, resumed and carried out by the house of Romanof.

For the purposes of such a notice as we could have desired, we have no need to lose ourselves in ethnological enquiries. The question from what Scandinavian tribe the small band of invaders came, who, though they established a brief ascendancy, soon passed into, and lost themselves in the conquered people, is one of rather languid interest. Rurik, their leader, was at any rate the undoubted founder of Russian nationality, but unlike Clovis, who stood in the same relation to France, he had not the advantage of an historian like Gregory of Tours. On his death, the empire, according to the invariable rule in such cases, was divided amongst his children, and their domains again were parcelled out to nominally dependant boyards or nobles, who, as in the rest of Europe, constantly thwarted and often overpowered the lord paramount. Side by side with the princes of the blood, were certain independent communities, or free cities, such as Kief and Novogorod, owing their principal importance to commerce, jealous of their franchises, turbulent and impracticable as Ghent or Brabant, and frequently treating with scant consideration the Tzar or Grand Prince, as the more dignified of the descendants of Rurik was called. This dignity for many ages fell not upon the direct descendant, but upon the next in blood to the founder of the dynasty, and in most instances the title conferred little more than an empty precedence upon its possessor ; the constant subdivision of the empire, and the substantial independence of the subordinate princes, narrowing every day the authority of their hierarchic head outside his own immediate domains. From time to time, however, men of no ordinary capacity succeed to the supreme dignity, and realize in many instances the supreme power, effecting in this way something, at least, towards the consolidation of the Russian monarchy, and introducing reforms not always transient, but found subsisting, centuries later, in one shape

or other, so as to afford standing-room and vantage ground for subsequent reformers. Amongst these men of superior intellect and energy, many were thrown into positions corresponding with those of princes who stand more in the view of history, and their course of action naturally supplies analogies that may be considered striking, while a certain refinement of policy and directness of judgment observable in Russian monarchs of later times, have not been wanting to the ruder predecessors.

The introduction of Christianity is always the æra in the history of a Christian people; but though we have no very accurate account of its establishment in Russia, there can be no question it was imposed upon the people in a somewhat abnormal way. The progress of the Greek Church in Russia, like that of Protestantism (happily so much less considerable) in Ireland, might be traced in the blood, not of the evangelizers, but of the evangelized, the multitudes having been driven to the rivers with whips, and baptized in batches by word of command. The violent and servile conditions of her birth have been and continue evident in the Russian Church throughout her history; and the scores of the whip are as red and angry now as they were in the days of Vladimir. The slavish devotion of the Russian ecclesiastics to the Tzar at all times is quite without example in history, unless it be that the English clergy in the reign of Henry VIII. furnish a disgraceful parallel. They appear at all times perfectly destitute of the erect and independent bearing of Churchmen, and when, to their humble petition for the restoration of the Patriarchate, Peter the Great flung them his sword, and told them to look upon that as their patriarch, they took him at his word, and did so without remonstrance. Possessed of great spiritual influence, endowed by the munificence of their princes with riches and privileges, they have consecrated all they have and are to the service of the sovereign alone; and this circumstance will account in great measure for the unquestioning obedience and uncomplaining endurance which has never ceased to be characteristic of the Russian people. For the rest, with the exception of the primates, who for some centuries were Greeks by nation, the bulk of the clergy had and have no tincture of letters whatsoever; (the Church offices, which are in the vulgar tongue, not enforcing acquaintance with any learned language); their ignorance being excessive,

their prejudices are impenetrable, and their morals being lax, they are deficient in self-respect.

It might be remarked as a strange coincidence, that the greatest men in Russian history were very often the greatest monsters. Thus Yaroslaf, their law-giver, was stained with every crime that disgraces humanity. Though he is regarded as the Russian Justinian, his laws are no-wise remarkable. They form, of course, the basis of Russian jurisprudence; and whatever be the merit of the code itself, its administration at the present day, its delays, its uncertainty, its perplexity, the multiplicity of its forms, the variety of appeals, the voluminousness and expense of the pleadings, (so to call them) and the general absurdity of the whole system are such as to make our own Chancery seem, by comparison, a haven of refuge, and our tribunals in general, not only incorrupt, which they are admittedly, but prompt and direct in their decisions. The great Vladimir Monomachus, however, stands in striking contrast to the vulgar great of Russia. His virtue in private life was undeniably, and his temperate but vigorous government afforded Russia one of those providential intervals in which a nation lays up strength against hours of trial which she could not otherwise outlive. That same system of appanages which spread desolation over France up to the reign of Henry IV., worked equally ill in Russia; so that we see the paramount dignity bandied about between eleven princes in the course of thirty-two years, and that, on the eve of the Tartar invasion, for which the country might have husbanded all its strength, and have had none to spare. We see nothing in French, or even in Irish history where there is a tolerable flush of kings, to equal such a state of affairs as this; but the remedy, which it took about two hundred years to administer, was something stranger still. The Tartars overspread and subjugated Russia, but from their nomadic habits not caring to embarrass themselves with its government, suffered the administration to remain in the hands of the old rulers, as farmers of the revenue. The grand prince was obliged to seek investiture from the Khan at the golden horde, performing the most degradingly menial services by way of homage, and paying a round sum in addition for his nomination. At length there came a grand prince who perceived that this position was not without a measure of advantage, which he set about improv-

ing accordingly. He recognized in the authority of the Tartars a power, which might be made available for the concentration of Russian strength in his own person and family, by being brought to bear upon the inferior princes, and upon the absurd system of collateral succession, the two causes of Russian weakness most in evidence. The Tartar princes fell into the snare, and forgetting, or not knowing the most elementary principles of government, where the dominion of the few is to be perpetuated, they not only neglected to encourage the anarchy and division they found existing, but in consideration of the gifts and professions of Alexander Newski, aggrandized the power of the grand prince by overwhelming his opponents, and allowed it to strike root, by confirming his son in the succession. The Russians have exhibited their gratitude to Alexander by placing him upon their altars ; and if the pursuit of a wily and successful policy be sufficient qualification for this distinction, no man deserved it better. His successors continued his policy with equal meanness, with vigour and ability more or less sustained, and with the like success. The Khans, on the other hand, persevered in their stupidity ; until at length, in the reign of Ivan III., we find the Tartar rule at an end, the principle of legitimacy or divine right in the direct line of succession exalted into a dogma and cherished like a superstition, the sovereign himself designated and worshipped as a terrestrial deity, in a word, all the distinctive features of the Russian monarchy in nearly as complete development as we see them to-day.

Ivan III. in character and career greatly resembles Louis XI. Ivan, however, was timid from infirmity, whereas Louis was cautious from principle, though by no means deficient in personal courage. Ivan avoided a battle simply through cowardice, whereas Louis was averse to risks as a matter of the coolest calculation, and never avoided an encounter where he calculated on success, measuring his spring with tiger-like precision ; but the same cruelty, the same policy, and the same bad faith, are characteristic of both princes. Their objects were identical ; —the reunion of Burgundy and Bretagne to the domains of the Crown was the aim of Louis ; but Ivan annihilated far more effectually the franchises of Novgorod and the power of Twer ; and after having raised the influence of the boyards to the proper level for reducing that of the

princes of the blood, remorselessly destroyed and flung away his instruments. The succeeding princes of his family, including Ivan IV. or the Terrible, with a glance at whose reign M. Mérimée begins his episode, appear to have pursued his policy from the sheer force of the impulsion he communicated to them, and not from having inherited his qualities. Ivan the Terrible was the last of the descendants of Rurik who could be said to reign. Of his two surviving sons, Feodor and Demetrius, the latter was of tender age, and the former, who nominally succeeded his father, from bodily weakness and mental imbecility abandoned the government of the State to Boris, his brother-in-law, whom he decorated with the title of regent.

Boris was able, daring, and unscrupulous; knowing when to punish and when to forbear, when to be forward and when to be remiss,—his policy would have been enlightened were it not so wicked; his immediate views were often virtuous, but his ultimate object was always corrupt. In due time he contrived the murder of the heir presumptive, Demetrius; the assassins fell by the violence of the multitude, and the multitude was exterminated by the vigour of Boris in course of law, so that to this day there is no judicial proof of his guilt. We pass over the account of the assassination of the Tzarevitch, and of the sham inquest ordered by Boris, though the details, as given by M. Mérimée in the *Pièces justificatives*, are very curious. The Tzarina Dowager, at whose instigation the mob had done summary justice upon the assassins of Demetrius, was shut up in a convent, and Feodor himself upon his deathbed bequeathed to Boris the titular, as he had already enjoyed the virtual, sovereignty. Boris, however, did not disdain to give a colour of legitimacy to his usurpation, by the ready resource of a popular election. He counterfeited reluctance for a decent period, distilled a few tears, and suffered a tardy consent to be wrung from him by the supplications of the people. But his tenure of power was short and evil, though it seemed to be wanting in no element of stability that material strength and a highly organized system of policy could communicate to it. The fact was, that worship of the lawful sovereign, which, where it exists is second to no passion in intensity, and its accompanying hatred of usurpation, animated, not, as in Scotland, a few patriotic clans, nor, as in France, one or two provinces, but the entire extent of Russia, so that no

sooner was an impostor found to play the part of the assassinated Tzarevitch, than the bare name of Demetrius dissolved the power of Boris almost more rapidly than the sudden spring of his climate breaks up the ice upon the Neva.

The false Demetrius, however, was no vulgar cheat. He is not to be confounded with our Simuels, or Warbecks, nor with the tailors, methodist preachers, or other mountebanks that have sought to personate Louis XVII. Active, vigilant, self-possessed, and heroic, he was gallant and proud in command, affable and dignified in conversation, soldier-like in suffering, and princely in rewarding. Without any experience, though with every aptitude for kingcraft; with many of the tastes and inclinations that have been so much exalted in Peter the Great, he only wanted somewhat of Peter's caution, and mere politicians would say, somewhat of Peter's bloodymindedness, to have maintained himself with glory on the throne of Russia. Boris was in the plenitude of his power, when the false Demetrius, whoever he might be in reality, (for it is beyond the reach* of investigation), disclosed his pretensions to a Polish prince, in some one of the ways ascribed to him by tradition, and an account of which we shall copy from M. Mérimée:—

“About the middle of the year 1603, at Béhn, in Lithuania, a young man, who had for some time been attached to the service of Prince Adam Wiszniowiecki, in the capacity of equerry, or valet de chambre, declared to him that he was the Tzarevitch Demetrius. He related that a physician named Simon, a Wallachian or German by birth, having become acquainted with the sinister designs of Boris, or rather having received large offers from him to destroy the life of the presumptive heir, had feigned consent in order that he might better frustrate the plans of the tyrant. On the night fixed for the assassination, this faithful servant had placed in the bed of the Tzarevitch, the child of a serf about the same age, who had been put to death. Feeling convinced that Feodor was so completely under the influence of Boris, that it would be impossible to obtain justice from him, the physician had fled from Ooglitch with young Demetrius, and had afterwards confided him to the care of a gentleman devotedly attached to his family, who, in order to rescue him more effectually from the hatred of Boris, had made him enter a convent. The physician was dead, as well as the gentleman to whom he had confided the prince. In the absence of these two witnesses, he produced a Russian seal, bearing the name and arms of the Tzarevitch, and a golden cross, adorned with precious

stones of considerable value. This, he said, was the present, which, according to Russian usage, he had received from his godfather on the day of his baptism.

"The young man who declared that he was the son of Ivan, appeared to be about twenty years of age. If Demetrius had lived he would have been twenty-two years old in 1603. He was small of stature, but broad-shouldered, and possessed of remarkable vigour and agility. His hair was sandy, indeed, almost red in colour ; his eyes were of a pale blue, and yet his complexion was very swarthy, as is frequently the case with the inhabitants of cold countries. It was well known that Maria Fëodorovna, the mother of Demetrius, was quite a brunette, and that Ivan the Terrible was rather below the middle height. Those who remembered the Tzar Ivan, perceived a family likeness in the face of the unknown ; and yet the Tzar was a handsome man, while the features of his pretended son were not at all prepossessing. Several of his contemporaries who had frequent opportunities of seeing him, represent him to have had a large face, prominent cheek bones, a flat nose, thick lips, and little or no beard ; and this description corresponds almost exactly with his portrait in the academy of St. Petersburgh, and with an engraving published in Poland, in 1606. We notice in it, as it were an exaggeration of the Slavic type, associated with an expression of remarkable firmness and energy. The unknown further exhibited two warts which he had, one on his forehead, and the other under his right eye. One of his arms also was rather longer than the other. All these signs, apparently, were well-known to have been remarked in the child who had died at Ooglitch."

* * * * *

The following account handed down to us by a contemporary who was personally acquainted with Demetrius and his Polish allies, though it probably does not deserve greater confidence, is nevertheless recommended by the colouring of a popular tradition, which it is impossible to neglect :—

"One day, at Behn, while Prince Adam Wiszniewiecki was in his bath, a young valet de chambre, who had been for some time in his service, forgot to bring him something which he had ordered. Irritated at this want of attention, the prince gave him a box on the ears, and called him by an opprobrious name. The young man, in great emotion, and with tears in his eyes, exclaimed, 'Ah, Prince Adam, if you knew who was serving you, you would not treat me in this way. But, alas ! I must endure every indignity, as I have taken upon myself the duties of a servant.' 'Who are you ?' enquired Wiszniewiecki. 'I am the Tzarevitch Demetrius, son of Ivan Vasilievitch.' Then he related the story of his miraculous escape, and showed his baptismal cross, enriched with dia-

monds. The prince was thunderstruck, but he believed all that this modest and good-looking young man had told him. He began by begging pardon for the blow and the insulting epithet which he had used towards him, and then he begged him to remain in the bath room, and await his return. Immediately he ran to seek his wife, and ordered her to prepare a magnificent repast, for he expected to have the Tzar of Muscovy as his guest, that very evening. Whilst the princess was expressing her astonishment at the sudden journey of the Tzar of Russia, her husband ordered six of his handsomest saddle-horses, dapple-grey in colour, to be harnessed, and commanded that each of them should be led by a groom, dressed as magnificently as possible. He further directed that a travelling carriage should be prepared, and fitted luxuriously with cushions and costly carpets. Lastly, he returned into the bath room, followed by twelve servants, bearing caftans of brocade, pelisses of sable, and arms encrusted with gold. He respectfully assisted his ex-valet-de-chambre to put on the richest dress, and then made him a present of the horses, carriage, and the rest. 'Will your majesty,' he said, 'deign to accept this trifle? All that I possess is at your service.' In this narrative we find all the ordinary characteristics of the Slavic legend. Nothing is omitted—neither the trappings of the horses, nor the colour of the garments, nor the price of the furs. The dialogue of the heroes is reported in the Homeric style. But why, beneath details thus embellished by an oriental imagination should there not lie concealed a truly historical tradition?

"Whatever were the means which Demetrius adopted for the revelation of his secret, the choice of his first confidant bore witness to his judgment and penetration. Prince Wiszniowiecki was sprung from the family of the Jagellons; was rich, well connected, allied to all the great families of Lithuania and Poland, and, moreover, generous, high-spirited, and vain—in a word, a true knight of the middle ages, somewhat out of place even at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Few efforts were required to persuade him that his guest was really the son of Ivan the Terrible. The diamond cross, which was of considerable value, appeared to him an irrefragable proof; such a jewel could belong to none but a Tzarevitch. He hastened to place his purse at the disposal of the young stranger, and, quite proud to find himself the protector of an unfortunate prince, he took him to the residence of his brother, prince Constantine, at Jalogicz. There, a new theatrical effect was in store for him; a fugitive Russian, named Pétrovski, a servant of the chancellor of Lithuania, appeared in the very nick of time to declare that he had formerly been in the service of the Tzarevitch Demetrius, and that he recognized him perfectly by the signs which have already been indicated.

"All doubts now ceased. The Polish nobles flocked to the residence of Prince Constantine Wiszniowiecki, to be presented to the legitimate Tzar of all the Russias. All vied with one another in

making him offers of service, and in receiving him with splendid festivities. Already the more ardent talked of mounting their horses, and invading Russia, for these warlike nobles were beginning to be tired of the existing truce. Others more prudent, advised the illustrious exile to proceed to Cracow, and apply to Sigismund for money and troops. On his part, Demetrius did nothing to belie his illustrious origin. Courteous, affable, and dignified, he appeared quite at ease in his gorgeous dress amidst the palatine nobles, accepting their services, with the air of a king granting a favour, and with the assurance that he would one day recompense their devotedness. He spoke Polish as well as, and perhaps even more fluently than Russian ; he knew a few words of Latin, wrote quickly and boldly, and this was quite enough at that period to prove that he had received a liberal education. Moreover, he was thoroughly acquainted with Russian history ; it was evident that he possessed an intimate knowledge of the genealogies of all the great families of the empire, and that their interests, rivalries, and varying fortunes had been made by him the subject of special study. In a word, he had diligently learned the part of a pretender, and played it admirably well. Skilful in deluding his hosts, he hinted, rather than avowed a certain partiality for Polish civilization, and spoke slightly of the institutions of Russia, and even of the superstitions of the Greek Church. Finally, (and this was no small merit in the eyes of a warlike nobility) he was an indefatigable hunter, and he exulted in all those exercises which require the display of dexterity or vigour."—pp. 44—49.

Boris, though of course no one had better reason to know how empty were the pretensions of Demetrius, was too well informed of all that was passing to miscalculate the chances in favour of the impostor. The king of Poland had not, it is true, recognized the Pretender as yet ; but Boris could not but suspect that Sigismund would naturally foster and develop any cause of division and weakness in Russia. On the other hand, supposing the king of Poland to stand aloof from the adventurer, he could in no way answer for his palatines, and the probability was, that the appeal of Demetrius to their knight-errantry would overbear every consideration of interest or prudence. Boris tempted the protectors of Demetrius with bribes, and they published his offers to the world, while the proclamations he issued against Demetrius only served to give to the cause of the latter that relief and publicity which were the indispensable conditions of success. His prospects improved from day to day. He contracted with Marina Misznek, the daughter of a powerful and distin-

guished palatine, nearly allied to his protectors, an engagement which he was destined to keep in the Kremlin. He conciliated the favour of the nuncio by an affected conversion to the Catholic faith, and a promise to promote the union of the Catholic and Russian Churches,—an expectation held out by more than one Grand Prince of Russia already, and by the Pretender with probably as little sincerity as by the others. He propitiated the king, by whom his pretensions were now approved and certified, with the promised cession of two provinces; but the support of Sigismund was ornamental and imposing rather than effective,—the real strength of Demetrius lying in the assistance of the palatines. Had not Sigismund been desirous to secure the promised advantages for Poland he might have saved his own responsibility; for the Polish constitution,—that strange and fatal arrangement by which, to use the slang of the day, anarchy was established in permanence and rebellion regularized,—had the equivocal advantage of enabling the king to prosecute his designs upon a neighbour under cover of his own helplessness to restrain or limit the independence of his nobles. With the aid, therefore, of a few hundred Polish lances, representing some two or three thousand troops, and the zealous co-operation of all who revered his assumed name or were disaffected toward Boris, after a series of brilliant victories, interrupted by one severe defeat, he seated himself upon the throne of the Tzars, but not before Boris had died of disappointment and remorse, and his son had been deserted by the army, while the Patriarch Job, who had excommunicated Demetrius as an unfrocked and apostate monk, was amongst the first to make submission and do him worship. He was even acknowledged with melodramatic demonstrations of tenderness by the mother of the real Demetrius, who was taken from her retreat to play this miserable part in public, and did so without any apparent reluctance; probably from her hatred to the family of Boris. The conduct of Demetrius after successes like these, is a strange compound of judgment and mistakes, of self-reliance and timidity, of recklessness and caution, of attempts to conciliate affection and the most contemptuous disregard of popular feeling, of good faith and prevarication, of haughtiness and condescension, in a word, of great and contrary qualities fermenting in a young and inexperienced mind, but which, under the extraordinary diffi-

culties of his position, and vitiated by the taint of imposture, ended in the catastrophe we shall transcribe from the account of M. Mérimée a few pages forward ; at present we shall give, in a slight extract, a specimen of the character and government of Demetrius, the similarity of which latter, in its better features, to that of Peter the Great, is quite striking.

" When he entered Moscow it was still a prey to the ravages of famine, and misery prevailed throughout the city. He succeeded in promptly remedying this sad state of things by wise regulations, which, by encouraging commerce and the importation of food, soon produced abundance in the place of dearth. He also applied himself from the very outset of his reign to reforming the administration of justice, by setting bounds to the rapacity of the judges, and prohibiting the slowness of their proceedings. Following the example of many Tzars whose name was cherished in the traditions of the people, he appeared every Sunday and Wednesday on the threshold of his palace, and there received all petitions with his own hands. He interrogated his petitioners with kindness, listened patiently to their statements, and frequently terminated with a single word an affair which had lasted for long* years. If he found it necessary to reject a request, he did it with so much consideration, that his obliging words gave almost as much satisfaction as if he had granted a favour.

" His indefatigable activity of mind and body astonished all his Court, but the Muscovites, accustomed to the solemn etiquette of their Tzars, thought that he was sometimes wanting in dignity. For example, instead of going to church in a carriage, according to custom, he repaired thither on horseback, and frequently on a restive steed, which he took delight in managing. When Ivan, Feodor, or Boris mounted on horseback (and that happened very rarely), a well-trained hackney was brought to them ; one dignitary of the empire placed a stool, another held the stirrup, the Tzar was lifted into his saddle, and the whole affair was managed gravely and deliberately. Matters had now thoroughly changed ; with the agility of a child of the Steppes, Demetrius loved to ride a restive stallion ; with one hand he seized the mane of his horse and leaped into his seat, before his officers had time to perform their respective duties. In former times the Tzars never passed from one room to another without being supported under the arms by several of their courtiers. They were guided and led about like children in leading-strings. All these tiresome ceremonies were now set aside. The new Tzar went out of his palace without informing any one, almost always without a guard, executing on the spur of the moment any

* de longues années,—a bad translation ; it ought to be, " years upon years," or something equivalent.

thought that occurred to his mind. He walked on foot through the town, sometimes inspecting the works of a cannon-foundry which he had just established at Moscow, sometimes entering into the shops, chatting with the merchants, especially with foreigners, and displaying great curiosity to examine everything, and become acquainted with the instruments and products of their industry. His chamberlains and body guards frequently had to look for him in street after street, and found it extremely difficult to find him again. Whenever he heard of any new branch of industry, he immediately became desirous to introduce it into Russia, and made the most advantageous offers to skilful artizans and enlightened merchants, in order to induce them to settle in his dominions. He was fond of the arts, and particularly of music. It is said that he was the first Tzar who took vocal and instrumental performers into his service. During his meals symphonies were executed, a Polish fashion then newly introduced, and regarded almost as scandalous by the Russians. Many persons would have preferred that he should have got drukk with his buffoons, like Ivan the Terrible, rather than that he should listen to Polish or German musicians. Contrary to the usage which was then general in Russia, he never indulged in the siesta after his meals ; he was always in motion. Even his diversions bore witness to his craving after activity. The most violent exercises were those which he preferred. Falconry and horse-racing were his means of relaxation after his labours in the Cabinet. A bold and accomplished horseman, he took delight in breaking-in the most unruly horses. One day at Zolininsk it was resolved that a bear-fight, the favourite amusement of the nobility of that period, should be got up in his honour. A bear was caught in the woods, and let loose again in a kind of arena, in which huntsmen armed with pikes put him to death, or were themselves torn to pieces by the infuriated animal. The pacific Feodor Ivanovitch used to take great pleasure in these cruel spectacles. But Demetrius was not a man to look at such conflicts from the top of a balcony. Disregarding the entreaties of his courtiers, he went down alone into the arena, ordered an enormous bear to be let loose upon him, and killed him with a thrust of his boar-spear.

"His skill in all warlike exercises and his dashing intrepidity gained him the admiration of his soldiers, and especially of the Cossacks, but the mass of the nation found it difficult to reconcile this restlessness and taste for useless dangers with the idea which they had formed to themselves of a Tzar of all the Russias. Scrupulous persons in particular found much to complain of in his conduct in all that regarded religious practices. He was inattentive at divine service ; he frequently forgot to salute the holy images before taking his meals ; and he sometimes rose abruptly from table without washing his hands. This was then considered the height of impiety. Another crime imputed to him was, that he did not go regularly to the bath on Saturdays. On the day of his

coronation, one of the Polish Jesuits who had accompanied him paid him a compliment in Latin, which no one understood, and the Tzar perhaps as little as any one, but the devotees had no doubt that the speech contained horrid blasphemies against the national religion, for all knew that Latin was the language of the Papists. Sometimes when speaking to Russian ecclesiastics he used the expression, *your religion, your worship*. It was inferred from this, that he had his own particular religion, which could be nothing else than the Latin heresy. At one of the sittings of the Imperial Council, it was represented to him that a proposition which he had just brought forward was condemned by the seventh *Œcumene* Council, the last whose authority is recognized by the Greek Church. 'Well,' he replied, 'what of that? The *eighth* Council may, very likely, come to a contrary decision on the matter.' What could have been his idea in uttering these imprudent words? It may be that he was ignorant of this point in ecclesiastical history; but at all events his words were regarded as an abominable blasphemy and an involuntary confession of Catholicism. It began to be whispered that this Tzar, so petulant, so full of contempt for ancient customs, might possibly not be a Russian, and that his orthodoxy was assuredly of a most suspicious character. As he loved magnificence, and affected to encourage the arts, he had caused to be placed at the door of a palace which he had just built a Cerberus in bronze, whose throat, says an annalist, gave forth a terrible noise whenever it was touched. This invention, the work of some German mechanic, and which does small credit to the taste of Demetrius, appeared to the eyes of the people a piece of devilry, and a fit ensign for a wizard's laboratory. The pious annalist from whom I borrow this anecdote, echoing, probably, the remarks of the Muscovite monks, regards it as presaging the abode which awaited the Tzar in eternity,—'Hell and darkness.'—pp. 124—28.

These and other circumstances, together with the intimate persuasion in the minds of the more intelligent among the boyards and of the clergy generally, that Demetrius was not the son of Ivan, and was ill-affected towards the national religion, were not slow to produce their effect. It is hardly to be questioned that many of the nobility were perfectly cognizant of the imposture, and expecting to find an instrument, were disappointed at meeting a master, and one of no ordinary mind. Difficult as they should have found it to endure the superiority of a real king, it was intolerable to submit to an impostor whose power was the creation of their fears, their jealousies, and their intrigues. Disaffection soon ripened into conspiracy; but the conspiracy was detected, and Demetrius, yielding

to a natural easiness of temper, or in pursuance of a policy that, even in the interest of humanity, is mistaken if incautious, forgave the conspirators, allowed them to retain their offices about his person, and appeared to repose the most unsuspecting confidence in their professions of repentance. After all, his safety might have been compatible with clemency, had he attended to the warning so communicated to him, and looked below the surface for the disaffection of which this conspiracy was the index. But while in most instances he refused to popular feeling and prejudice the deference of which they are so exacting, he at the same time neglected the simplest precautions for his personal security ; and while exasperating to the utmost the religious fanaticism of his subjects by his marriage with the Polish Princess Marina Misznek, he affronted the king of Poland by the assumption of the title of emperor, being, in fact, the first Russian prince who appeared to conceive an adequate notion of the dignity of the vast monarchy of all the Russias. And yet, without receiving the temporal wages of hypocrisy and sacrilege, he was guilty of both ; for whether we look upon him as a Catholic or schismatic at heart, (the probability is, he was neither one nor the other) his open profession of the Greek faith, his secret profession of the Catholic, and the zeal he put on before his subjects for the conversion of Marina to their schism, involve both offences in their highest degree. But it availed him nothing with those who had determined his destruction, and his marriage gave the most fatal impulse to their movements. In order to keep faith with Marina he was ruining himself in the opinion of his subjects ; and on the other hand, that he might break faith with the king of Poland in the matter of the provinces, he was anxious to provoke a quarrel, by the assumption of the imperial title, and at the same time exhibit himself to his subjects as upholding the dignity of Russia. He had received abundant warning of his danger, but few princes have ever understood a warning. Cæsar, Charles I., James II., Louis XVI., Napoleon, Charles X., and Louis Philippe, all received their warnings, and neglected them with almost equal fatuity. Everything contributed to hasten the downfall of Demetrius. The contemptuous demeanour of the Poles in the escort of Marina, their irreverence in the church during the marriage service, their proud bearing and a certain air of conquest which they did

not care to disguise, or rather exhibited with ostentation, were not lost upon the multitude, and the treatment by the pseudo-Tzar of the Polish ambassadors did not expiate the offence of marrying a Polish princess, loving Polish civilization and contemning Russian barbarism. Yet, as it would appear, he might have held good his position but for that strange openheartedness which comported so ill with all that he had done and was still doing. He dismissed his Cossack and Polish guards, on whom he could have relied to the last man, and exposed himself on all occasions in a way to court attack. At length the term of his astonishing career was at hand, and the first false Demetrius was about to close his reign as the unfortunate Paul was destined to do some hundred years later. The conspirators, taught by the issue of their former plot, had this time matured and digested their plans; and Demetrius put them to no trouble in the selection of a time for their execution.

"On the 28th of May, a large number of soldiers from the camp, in the neighbourhood of Moscow, entered the city in groups, especially those belonging to the Novgorod contingent, who were thought to be badly disposed towards the emperor. Demetrius was either ignorant of this, or attached no importance to it. He passed the evening and part of the night in feasting, and it was almost day-break when he dismissed his guests. Before retiring to rest, he went out to breathe a little fresh air on the steps of his palace, and there he met Afanasse Vlassief, one of the conspirators, who had been probably sent by the rest to reconnoitre. Surprised to see him at such an hour, the Tzar enquired if he brought any message from Sigismund's ambassadors, with whom his duties compelled him to reside. Vlassief gave an evasive answer, and withdrew, to announce to his accomplices that the palace was slumbering in the profoundest security. The leaders of the plot were assembled in the house of Basil Schuisky, and some still hesitated. Schuisky declared to them that there was not a moment to be lost; that the Tzar had surprised their secret, and given orders already for their execution; and that the only way to save their heads was to anticipate the tyrant by a bold stroke. Immediately after, seeing them animated by the courage of despair, he ordered the signal to be given for the onslaught.

"A troop of boyards and gentlemen had already collected in the public square on horseback, with their coats of mail on their shoulders, and their bows in their hands. At the head of the most determined, Schuisky presented himself at the Gate of the Saviour, which was immediately given up to him by the guards, whom he

had corrupted beforehand. He then entered the Kremlin; as he passed before the Church of the Assumption, Basil halted, dismounted from his horse, and knelt before the venerated image of our Lady of Vladimir, as if to implore her protection in this supreme moment of his destiny; then, rising from his knees with an inspired air, and brandishing a cross above his head, he exclaimed, 'Orthodox Christians, death to the heretic!' The great bell was then tolled, and, one after another, all the three thousand bells of Moscow answered its sound. At the same time small troops of the conspirators ran through the suburbs, shouting, 'To arms! To the Kremlin! the Tzar is being assassinated!' The people in emotion, rushed in crowds into the streets, and enquired, 'Who are the assassins of the Tzar?' 'The Lithuanians,' answered the conspirators; and thus they drew after them an immense mob, armed with axes and clubs. The populace, persuaded that the Poles, whom they already hated for their insolence, were meditating an act of treason, rushed towards their dwellings, which had previously been marked with chalk, broke through the doors of the houses, and began to massacre the sleeping inmates. The bravest of the Muscovites, guided by a few boyards, hastened to the Kremlin, where the conspirators had already started another war cry, and proclaimed that the emperor and the Poles intended to assassinate the boyards.

"At the first sound of the alarm bell, the Tzar, who had just retired to his apartment, sent to enquire of Demetrius Schusky, who was on duty at the palace, the cause of the noise which he heard. Demetrius replied that a great conflagration had just broken out, and then hastened to rejoin his brother Basil, whom he found at the head of a numerous and well-appointed troop. Presently the tocsin, repeated by all the churches of Moscow, and mingling with the deafening clamours of the multitude, announced to Demetrius that a more serious event than a conflagration had set the whole town in commotion. Whilst he was hastily dressing, he sent Basmanof to enquire into the cause of the tumult. The outer court was already filling with an armed crowd, uttering the most furious threats. 'Deliver to us the impostor,' cried a thousand menacing voices, as soon as Basmanof appeared in view. He hastily returned into the palace, ordered the halberdiers to take their arms, and then, running in to the Tzar, exclaimed, 'Alas! master, the people desire your life; save yourself; as for me, I will die in your defence!' At this moment one of the conspirators, who, by favour of the tumult, had penetrated into the bed-room of the Tzar, came up and said to him: 'Well! unlucky emperor, so you are awake at last. Come and give an account to the people of Moscow.' Basmanof, indignant at this outrage, seized the Tzar's sabre, and split the intruder's head; then he hastened to the balcony, which was already occupied by the conspirators. Demetrius, armed with the sword of one of his guards, followed his faithful

general, shouting to the rebels : ' I will show you that I am not a Boris.'

" It is said that he slew several with his own hand. Basmanof had thrown himself in front of the assassins ; sometimes entreating, sometimes threatening, he protected the Tzar with his own body, and dealt terrible blows on every side. While he was endeavouring to defend the door-step and the approaches of the stair-case, the boyard Tatischef, on whose behalf he had interceded with Demetrius a few days before, struck him with a knife, and he fell by his master's side. At the same time a charge of musketry compelled the body guards to draw back, and presently to surrender the stair-case. As they were unprovided with fire arms, they dragged Demetrius into the interior of the palace, and attempted to barricade the doors. Then began a succession of sieges. From the vestibule to the innermost apartments, every room was defended and carried one after another. The insurgents firing their arquebuses through the crevices of the doors, drove back the body guards. Then the door was cut down with the hatchets, and the room broken into ; the next room was attacked, and taken in the same manner. At last, driven from behind their last barricade, the German guards were brought to bay in the Tzar's bath-room, and compelled to lay down their useless halberds ; but the emperor was no longer among them, and no one knew as yet what had become of him.

* * * * *

" As for Demetrius, seeing the first door of the palace broken through, and feeling convinced that all resistance was useless, he threw down his sword, ran through the apartments of the Tzarina, and made his way to the chamber most remote from the place which the rebels were assailing. He had, it is said, received a sabre wound in his leg. However, he opened a window, which looked into the open space where the palace of Boris, which he had ordered to be demolished, had formerly stood. The window was more than thirty feet above the ground, but there was no one in the neighbourhood ; and he jumped down. In the fall he had the misfortune to break his leg, and the pain was so intense ; that he fainted. A moment after he recovered his consciousness, and his groans attracted the attention of a few Strelitz, from a neighbouring guard-house, who recognized him. Moved with compassion, these soldiers lifted him up, gave him some water to drink, and seated him on a stone, which remained of the foundations of the palace of Boris. The Tzar regained sufficient strength to speak to the soldiers, who swore to defend him. In fact, when the rebels came to demand their prey, they replied by discharging their arquebuses, and killed several of the foremost rioters. But soon the crowd increased, attracted by the tumult, and by shouts that the Tzar had at length been discovered. The Strelitz were surrounded and threatened ; they were called upon to give up the impostor, or the mob would

go to their suburb, and massacre their wives and children, who had been left there defenceless. Then the frightened Strelitz laid down their arms, and abandoned the wounded man. With horrible acclamations of triumph, the multitude fell upon him, and dragged him with blows and imprecations to a room in the palace, which had been already pillaged. As Demetrius, in the power of the executioners, passed before his captive body guards, he extended his hand towards them in token of farewell, but did not utter a word. One of his gentlemen, a Livonian, named Furstenberg, transported with rage, attempted, though unarmed, to defend him. The rebels transfixes the brave fellow with a thousand blows, whilst he was vainly endeavouring to preserve his master. If Demetrius was not instantly massacred, it was only because the ingenuous hatred of his assassins wished to prolong his sufferings. He was stripped of his imperial robes, and the caftan of a pastry cook was thrown over him. 'Look at the Tzar of all the Russias,' shouted the rebels, 'he has now put on the dress which befits him.' 'Dog of a bastard,' said a Russian gentleman, 'tell us who you are, and whence you came.' Demetrius collected all his remaining strength, and raising his voice, said, 'Every one of you knows that I am your Tzar, the legitimate son of Ivan Vassilievitch. Ask my mother if it is not so; or, if you desire my death, at least give me time to confess myself.' Thereupon a trader named Valonief, breaking through the press, cried out, 'Why talk so long with this dog of a heretic? This is how I'll shrive this Polish piper;' and he fired a shot from his arquebus into the breast of the Tzar, which put an end to his agony.'

The terrible death of Demetrius the Impostor is amongst the most memorable instances how closely the "Hosanna" may be attended by the "crucifigatur." And yet the disaffection was shown, by subsequent events, not to have spread beyond the walls of Moscow. Nay, within the city itself the people must have been indifferent from the beginning to the misdoings of the Tzar, or else have begun already to lapse into the reverence for authority habitual to Russians; for it was in the name of the Tzar, and under pretence of rescuing him from the Poles, that the conspirators brought the crowd into action; and it was only when the blood of the insurgents was fevered by slaughter and debauchery, that the real purpose of the assassins was declared. We have not hesitated to suppress a good many details of M. Mérimée's account, as not being under the like obligation with an historian to exactitude, though at the expense of decency. The mutilation of the unfortunate Demetrius—the outrages perpetrated alike by serf and

boyard—the murder and debauchery that reigned throughout the orgies of that dreadful night, are almost too shocking for recital. Could we afford it, we should copy with more pleasure the enquiry into the real origin of Demetrius, which M. Mérimée has prosecuted with intelligence and candour. He gives at length the conflicting theories of the Russian historians, as to who was Demetrius, and who were his instigators. The writers in question, ashamed, doubtless, of the credulity of their nation, ashamed of the perfidy and heartlessness of their nobility, at a loss to justify the servility and time-serving of the clergy, have done their utmost to disparage the character of Demetrius, though it were devoutly to be wished that the greater number of their legitimate princes were half so worthy to reign. This was a signal error of judgment, besides being an offence against truth: for if facts were to be coloured at all, it was the obvious course to exaggerate the great and brilliant qualities of the impostor, and in this way show up the deception practised upon an entire people as somewhat intelligible and excusable.

The events which followed the death of the first pretender, are about the most melancholy in Russian history. Another Demetrius soon appeared, and though *his* imposture was of the coarsest texture, yet so great was the influence of the name, that with the aid of a few adventure-seeking Poles, the second Demetrius, though every way contemptible, and not to be named with his gallant prototype, was soon at the head of a devoted army. Marina Misznek did not hesitate to ally herself with the new impostor, and although in this, as in other respects, one of the most worthless, not to say vicious characters in the history, exhibited in the last extremity a certain energy, and some slight working of the spirit of Margaret of Anjou. But, generally speaking, she had not a particle of that characteristic virtue of nobility, that, according to the truthful saying of Euripides, always increases its transmitted honours, when it falls upon the worthy.

*δεινὸς καρακτὴρ κύπισημος ἐν βροτῶις
ἐσθλῶν γενέσθαι, καπὲ μείζον ἔρχεται
τῆς εὐγενείας ὅρμα τοῖσιν ἀξίοις.*

She valued the crown for its tinsel only, and appears neither to have understood nor valued the heroic qualities of her deceased husband; she belied her birth, disgraced

her family and nation, and was deservedly forgotten and disowned by both. The moment was now opportune for Polish invasion. One assassin of Demetrius succeeded to his chair only to be displaced by another, until at length it was proposed to give the crown to the son of Sigismund, on condition he would embrace the Greek schism. But Sigismund scorned to take under conditions, or owe to election what he might command peremptorily and enforce by arms; and were it not for the fatuity which seemed to mar every success throughout this history, or rather, were it not that Providence had reserved a fiery trial for Poland and her faith, the brightest page of a military history already so bright, seemed destined to be illustrated by the union of all the Slavonic races under the Catholic sceptre of Poland. The battle of Klouchino, won by Zolkiewski, with three thousand Polish cavalry, against an army of Russians and foreign mercenaries sixteen times its strength, was the prelude to other victories of that glorious old chief, moral as well as material, which installed the Poles once more in the Kremlin. For Zolkiewski, by his generous demeanour towards the vanquished, and by the strict discipline he maintained amongst the conquerors; by no contemptuous forbearance, but by genuine conciliation and unaffected friendliness of manner, went more than half way in reconciling the Russians, including the clergy, to the rule of Ladislaus, the son of Sigismund, to whom they had even sworn obedience. But Sigismund claimed the empire not for his son, but for himself. He assumed the title of Tzar, and ordered ukases to be issued in his name. The event corresponded with his folly. War broke out anew all over Russia, and though the handful of Poles maintained its ascendancy, and held its ground against the force of circumstances for a surprisingly long period, it was physically impossible that, situated as Poland was, with a constitution so absurd, and a king so wrong-headed, the Polish cause could triumph, and the election of Mikhail Romanof took place when the Poles had been already driven by overwhelming numbers from all their strongholds in Russia.

It is quite with a touch of enthusiasm M. Mérimée records the services rendered to Russia by the patriotic butcher Minin, to whose harangues Russia is mainly indebted for her independence and her present race of emperors, and the traditions of whose trade, it will not be denied, have

been faithfully preserved by the Romanofs. Not being Russians ourselves, and not pretending to anything like pure cosmopolitanism, we cannot say we dwell with pleasure on any event or series of events which led, however remotely, to the fall of Poland. It was, on the contrary, with a feeling of irrepressible melancholy we read the last successes of Poland, and our heart was touched anew as we reverted to the fate of that glorious land so dear to memory and so sacred to sorrow. We grieved to think that her pure cause should be under the detestable protection of democracy; to see the palm of her confession broken and repudiated, and the purple of her martyrdom dabbled in the base blood that ran upon the barricades of '48. We know it was the Nemesis of Poland that plied her scourge by the hands of Bem and Dembinski, but we could wish to see her more nobly avenged, and in a lawful field. In the war which Russia has so determinedly drawn upon herself, does no statesman look to the reconstitution of Poland as an issue? Does no monarchist think of detaching from revolution her most formidable ally? Does no liberal think of opposing a bulwark to the encroachments of despotism? Does Napoleon III. mean to repeat the crime and blunder of Napoleon I., in trifling with the liberties of Poland? Does it ever occur to Austria or Russia, that if their right eye scandalize them, it were well to pluck it out, and that it is better to continue in life without Gallicia and Posen, than to go down with Gallicia and Posen into that terrestrial empire of darkness which is ruled by the "terrestrial deity" of the Russians.

Not, indeed, that we covet the destruction of Russia. Surely the day must come when this mighty empire shall be redeemed from that spiritual isolation to which she has blindly linked her own destinies. In the present universal corruption of opinion, with the dry rot eating into the whole structure of society, amid the smouldering fires of democracy in Europe, and in presence of their scarce restrained fury in America, a power so stately, so firm, so well knit as Russia might be within her natural boundaries, wide enough, surely, for every purpose of grandeur and security,—could hardly be too strong to face the contingencies for which we shall have to be prepared. But whatever be the issue of the present struggle, our prayer is for the exaltation of the faith, the vindication of the right, and the confusion of injustice, whoever be the

oppressed and whoever the oppressors ; in which prayer is included the aspiration, that Poland, Ireland, and whatever other people is suffering for justice sake may one day have to sing in common jubilee, EXORTUM EST IN TENEBRIS LUMEN RECTIS !

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

- 1.—*All for Jesus; or the Easy Ways of Divine Love.* By FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. Second edition. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1853.
- 2.—*The Devotion to the Heart of Jesus; with an Introduction on the History of Jansenism.* By JOHN BERNARD DALGAIRNS, Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1853.

It would be superfluous to notice these works, were it only for the purpose of recommending them to the Catholic public. The first, by Father Faber, is about to be brought out in a third edition ; a third within a few months. Thanks be to God, it has been read by Protestants, bought at railway libraries, and such places, where no Catholic book has ever yet been thought of ; it is read by priests, religious communities, by the poor, who are happy enough to get at it, and doubtless by those to whom it is specially addressed—the devout, who are living in the world. It is doing its work, speeded by a benediction which will surely cause it to produce great results. Father Dalgairns' treatise upon the Devotion to the Sacred Heart is of more recent publication, but it will not lag behind ; it is similar in its object, similar in the glow of fervour by which these writers seem to have lighted up the deep mysteries of Theology ; and if it wants something of the vernacular idiom of that curious mixture of familiarity and strength by which Father Faber has always laid such strong hold on the attention of his hearers, it is superior in dignity and elegance of style. We say again we have no occasion to recommend these works to our readers ; but it is due to

ourselves that we should express our cordial admiration of them. To the books themselves we must refer our readers, for the great things that can be said in favour of the devotions to the Sacred Heart, and to the Precious Blood of our Redeemer. Both these devotions—long cherished on the continent—are of recent introduction in this country. Both are now introduced under the sanction of venerable communities, and promise a vast increase of blessings upon the Catholic Church, which, in this land, has so lately received its full organization ; in the perfected dignity and jurisdiction of the leaders, who are to guide her through all the perils of the times. Let no Catholic say, “I am devout to my Redeemer ; I do not understand these new methods of adoration :” let him read these books, and yield himself to the impulse he will surely receive from them. Upon the great subject of entering into the spirit of the Church, nothing can be said more suggestive than Father Dalgairns’ preface to his treatise upon Jansenism. This subtle and *clinging* heresy, has been at all times the subject of peculiar doubts ; men have doubted *facts* : the austere lives, the dishonest logic, and the splendid talents of its professors ; above all, the position they insisted on retaining within the external pale of the Church, which had condemned them : all these circumstances have raised a mist about this heresy in the minds of the uninformed. Dryden has called Jansenism the “only stain” the milk-white hind had ever known. Some have supposed it to be a difference of opinion in the Church ; some—misled by the great power of Pascal—may have rashly called in question the interposition of the Jesuits. Those who would correct such false ideas, who would see facts and characters in their true light, should read Father Dalgairns’ account of this heresy ; upon the occasion of which, and, as it would seem, by the immediate appointment of Divine Providence, the devotion to the Sacred Heart took its rise in the Church. It is probable that we shall take further notice of these important publications.

II.—*Loss and Gain; or, the Story of a Convert*, by the Very Rev. Dr. NEWMAN. Third edition. James Duffy, 7, Wellington Quay, Dublin.

The illustrious president of the Catholic University has re-published several of his works in Ireland ; and we are glad to see that “Loss and Gain” has

reached a third edition. This work gives an admirable picture of what is called "the religious world" of England. The various shades of Anglicanism are here most accurately depicted. From the reckless "Romanizing" of White, and his ecclesiastical female friends, to the Plymouth brotherism of the young lady, who, towards the end of the story, and after Charles Reding had determined to seek admission into the Catholic Church, so obligingly intimated that her friends were open to receive doctrinal suggestions from him, and that their "views" were in progress of development,—each religious community is most justly described, and in a manner that can perhaps only be fully appreciated by those who have had some acquaintance with the originals. Many Catholics who have had the happiness to be born such, are often unable even to understand the Anglican theory and position, especially that of the "Romanizing" Puseyites, who look down with such contempt on their "mere Anglican" brethren (as they have sometimes designated them); and this difficulty is probably felt even more in Ireland than in England. But a perusal of this work will go far to enable them to understand the position and arguments of the Oxford school, and of the other religious parties into which England has been divided by the "Reformation." *Loss and Gain* was no doubt chiefly written with a view to the benefit of Anglicans themselves; and though the false sanctimoniousness of some of them has prevented their reading it, we have reason to believe that not a few members of that party in the establishment have received signal benefit from its perusal. The work is neatly bound in cloth: and the price is lower than that of former editions.

III.—1. *The Life of St. Francis of Assisi, with an Essay*, by the Very Rev. Father Faber, vol. i. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

2.—*Life of the Blessed Paul of the Cross*, vol. i. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

Both these volumes have a peculiar and a double interest; on account of the eminence of the saints whose lives are given; and also from the admirable instructions and prefaces by which they are introduced. The great St. Francis of Assisi is reverenced by all Catholics as a Saint amongst saints; the co-labourer with St. Dominic in the

revival of fervour at a time of great relaxation ; the head of a new and most illustrious order, the wonderful type of Christ, in His life and person. It is, perhaps,—we speak it under correction,—because the life of St. Francis in the *greatness* of its characteristics, seemed to comprehend all the attributes of sanctity ; that Father Faber has affixed to it his admirable essay upon the study of hagiology. This, in itself, is a most valuable work, and one which we earnestly recommend to our readers. It contains instructions upon the use to be derived from the study of the lives of the saints, the spirit in which they should be read, and the place which they should occupy in the great science of training the Christian soul unto life eternal. Those who are acquainted with the instructions, whether verbal or written, of Father Faber, will not doubt how much new—popularly speaking—and striking light he will have thrown upon a question which has been often discussed amongst Catholics, and often not in a very Catholic spirit. The Blessed Paul of the Cross took in us Englishmen an interest so supernaturally, so tenderly charitable, as cannot but excite a grateful response in the coldest hearts amongst us. “England was always the country of his predilection. It might almost appear to those who knew him well, as if he had no heart, no feeling, but for England. England was always in his thoughts ; England was constantly the subject of his discourse ; England was always before him in his prayers. For the space of not less than fifty years, he prayed for England without intermission, as will be seen in his life.” “Oh, what have I seen this morning !” he exclaimed after an ecstasy, “my children, the Passionists, in England ! My children in England !” (Introduction.) And the propitious vision has been fulfilled ; his spiritual children have inherited from him a love for our country, and some zealous souls in England have corresponded to their wish to come and labour here. Dr. Milner foretold their coming, and finally, Cardinal Wiseman, then coadjutor to Dr. Walsh, made it one of his first acts, as bishop, to establish the Passionists in England ; first at Aston Hall, then under the patronage of William Leigh, Esq. (a convert, who is building for them a house and church) ; and lastly, at the Hyde, near London. We all remember the venerable and saintly Father Dominic, then the superior in this country : it may not be as well known that one of the chief reasons which induced the

Hon. Mr. Spencer to join the order, was, that the spirit of its Institute and its founder offered an ample scope to the charity of his heart for England. There are few who have not—in one way or other—been implored by Father Ignatius to offer up “prayers for England.” We will, though it is travelling beyond our immediate purpose, take this opportunity of making known the association he has organised, for the conversion of heretics and schismatics in England, and over the whole world. The Association for the “Propagation of the Faith” has for its object the conversion of the heathen,—that of the Sacred Heart of Mary the salvation of sinners,—this fills up the interval; it is enriched by many indulgences, its conditions are not onerous; to labour for the conversion of England, to pray for it, to endeavour to advance the association, and to sanctify our own souls. Father Ignatius himself enrols the names of those who are desirous of thus uniting themselves in act and in spirit to the charity which burns for us in the hearts of the Passionists, as it did in that of the founder of their order, Blessed Paul of the Cross.

VI.—*Dramas of Calderon, Tragic, Comic, and Legendary.* Translated from the Spanish, principally in the metre of the original. By DENIS FLORENCE M'CARTHY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, author of “Ballads, Poems, and Lyrics,” &c. London: Dolman, 1853.

How many of our readers have, from their youth upwards, heard of the name of Calderon with reverence,—have associated him, in their thoughts, even with the greatness of Shakespeare,—yet have not read one line of the poet to whom they have undoubtedly assigned so high a place; and, indeed, know nothing of him unless it be from Frederick Schiller’s masterly analysis, or perhaps from a few brilliant extracts. To these, and to all lovers of genuine poetry, Mr. M’Carthy’s book will be a great acquisition; for he has expressed to us the works of this great poet as only a poet could have done; he has translated them with freedom and spirit, yet has conscientiously, and with great care and nice perception, preserved all the characteristics of his author. We feel, while reading these dramas, that they have the spirit of another age and another land; but there is no obscuring veil between the poet’s mind and ours. We can enjoy almost in perfection Calderon’s noble strain of thought, and his rich poetic fancy,

antique, original, and untrammelled. Henceforward, these beautiful poems belong to us; they will form part of our literature, and we are thankful to Mr. M'Carthy for having made us so well acquainted with a poet, the delight and glory of old Spain, and who well deserves, not merely to receive the meed of honour, but also the tribute of appreciation and enjoyment.

V.—1. *Convents.* A Review of Two Lectures on this subject.

By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour. Embodying the substance of a lecture delivered at the Catholic Chapel, Bath, on Sunday, May, 23, 1852. By His Eminence Cardinal WISEMAN. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

2.—*The Catholic Doctrine on the Use of the Bible.* Being a Review of His Grace Archbishop DIXON's "Catholic Introduction to Scripture." By His Eminence Cardinal WISEMAN. (Published in the Dublin Review.) London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1853.

The readers of this Review will be glad to see two of Cardinal Wiseman's articles reprinted separately; the subjects of these articles were so opportune, and so admirably treated, that all must have desired to have them at hand for distribution. This desire is now accomplished, and at a very low price. Catholics may now be supplied with unanswerable replies to all the objections so constantly brought against them by Protestants, upon the two main points in our religion, of "Convents," and "the use of the Bible."

VI.—*Remarks on the Production of the Precious Metals, and on the Depreciation of Gold.* By Mons. MICHEL CHEVALIER, member of the Institute of France. Translated by D. FORBES CAMPBELL, Esq. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1853.

A Treatise of great authority, and well worthy of the attention of those who are curious upon this now all-important subject.

VII.—*India: Its Government under a Bureaucracy.* By JOHN DICKINSON, Jun., M. R. A. S., M. R. Geog. S. London: Saunders and Stanford, 1853.

We earnestly recommend the perusal of this treatise. At this time public attention is awakened to the Government and the affairs of India, and to the necessity of some change in the mode of conducting them. Now, then,

there is at last a hope that the suggestions of an experienced and able man may do good. Public opinion brought actively to bear upon the impending deliberations of Parliament, may produce happy results, and our government of that great country become at last just, prosperous, and *Christian*. If anything can excite public interest and public opinion upon the wrongs of this our far-distant dependency, it will be the wide circulation of such pamphlets as the one before us, in which warm and powerful writing is used, not for declamation, but to enhance proved and incontrovertible facts. The authorities quoted by Mr. Dickinson must carry conviction, and the case he has made out for India is carefully examined and established at every point. It is of good augury when the truth becomes known. Let us hope in this instance it may not fall to the ground.

VIII.—*The Catholic Almanack and Guide to the Service of the Church, for the Year of our Lord 1854.* Permissu Superiorum. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

We have now a *penny* Catholic Directory, for the above may almost be called such. Besides the Calendar and Church Festivals, and some useful secular information, it contains an interesting memoir of the Cardinal Archbishop (apparently quoted, with some additions, from Mr. Gawthorn's *Westminster Abbey*); the English Hierarchy, with the Cathedral Chapters; the Bishops of Scotland, the Archbishops of Ireland, the Colonies, and the United States of America; with other Ecclesiastical information, rendering it altogether an extremely useful Almanack. We may mention that there are also better editions, with engravings, and interleaved, one of them being in a pocket-book form, with several additional prints.

IX.—*Kate Geary; or, Irish Life in London, a tale of 1849*, by Miss MASON. London: Dolman, 1853.

The specific object of this work is to exemplify the various ways in which the poor are placed at a disadvantage, and the misery, and, almost of necessity, the crime that ensue from their present crowded condition. Hidden away, as they now are, into the alleys, mews, and back streets,—what may be called the nooks and corners of our great cities, few, except those officially employed in such

investigations, are aware how limited is the space allotted to our labouring population ; how impossible for them to enlarge it ; how, as year after year, their numbers increase, or some great line of streets is driven through their quarters, they become more and more huddled together, and so closely packed, that at last all notion of a home is lost. No doubt there is a general idea that there is much to be remedied in this state of things ; and some of its most disgusting horrors have been brought before the public with sickening distinctness. Many, however, may turn from such descriptions with the thought that, like all other refuse, the refuse of humanity, will ever sink : sink to the lowest depths of vileness and obscurity. Such persons should note the difficulties of the *virtuous* poor ; should observe how hard it is for an honest labourer to find, at a reasonable expense and distance from his work, a decent room, where his wife may keep their little property and their children to themselves ; how difficult it is for them to withdraw themselves ever so little from wicked, or violent, or unpleasant characters, in the crowd that swarms around them ; how intolerable the constant intrusion upon their privacy ; how all but impossible, under such circumstances, to keep the little ones from contamination. Such considerations, if they did nothing more, would teach us indulgence for many a failing. Miss Mason describes the life of one who might be called a sister of charity, living in the world, and this is not the least valuable part of the work in our estimation ; she tells us she has witnessed the incidents of her tale, and this we should not have doubted ; they are described with a vivacity, and there is a deep interest running through them, which truth and nature only could give. We regret that the authoress should have thought it necessary to entangle her heroine in a love affair, which, in itself, is very frigid and tedious, spoils the ideal of a charming character, and, as far as it goes, detracts from the merits of the work. Indeed, we must observe that a person, writing from nature, may find, as Miss Mason has done, a remarkable variety of incident in the lives of the poor ; and needs no other material for the construction of a most interesting story.

X.—*Praxis Synodi Diocesanæ Celebrandæ. Ex opere D. B. GAVANTI redacta. Permissu Superiorum. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.*

The assembling of our Diocesan Synods is the most recent development of the Hierarchy, and from it great good will no doubt result. The above work, edited by a Bishop, and published with authority, will be found most useful by all those who have to take part in these Synods; and we are glad to see that it is so well printed and got up. There are two editions, quarto and octavo.

XI.—*The Hero's Child, and other Poems.* By ANNA M. DEBENHAM. Hughes: Ave Maria Lane, London.

Miss Debenham has published a very fair volume of poetry on the whole, though it is occasionally open to criticism. The authoress is a Protestant; but we have not observed any doctrinal errors in her work. She states in the introduction to her poem on Baptism (addressed to an absurd objector), that *she* believes in the cleansing efficacy of that Sacrament,—a very necessary piece of information in these times. We think some of the *titles* of the poems might have been better chosen; and this remark applies especially to the last one in the volume,—not by any means a bad composition in itself.

XII.—*A History and Description of Westminster Abbey, with Illustrations on steel.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

Westminster Abbey must ever be regarded with interest by the Catholic, containing, as it does, the sacred relics of our sainted Edward (not to mention its other attractions), especially now that our Metropolitan See takes its title from this ancient city. The above description will, no doubt, therefore, be acceptable to many persons, both Catholic and Protestant, who have found the ordinary guide books (though three times the price) inconvenient and unreadable, even apart from their irreverent criticisms. It has engravings of St. Edward, and several other saints, whose names are connected with the Abbey; and professor Donaldson's very interesting paper on the present state of the once glorious shrine of St. Edward, and the other ancient monuments, is appended.

XIII.—*A Brief Summary of the Four Books of the Imitation of Christ*; showing the general scope of the work, and the connexion of the different Chapters. From the Italian. London: Burns and Lambert, 1853.

We have always been accustomed to consider the 'Imitation of Christ' remarkable for its plainness, for its simple straightforwardness, intelligible to every capacity. We are surprised, therefore, to find that it has been thought desirable to write, and to translate an elucidation of its teaching, in the form of short 'arguments,' as they are sometimes called, or heads of chapters, summing up the contents. We can but say, that whatever promotes the reading or the understanding of the "Imitation of Christ" is good; and if this little work is to have this effect, success to it.

XIV.—*Luther: A Succinct View of his Life and Writings*. By Dr. J. DOELLINGER. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

This sketch of the life of the great heresiarch of modern times, from the pen of the eminent Church historian, Dr. Doellinger of Munich, is full of interest and instruction; whilst the name of its author makes it worthy of every reliance.

We regret however, that the *translation* is not so good as we could wish. At p. 19 there is a sentence of *as many lines*, the drift of which it is most difficult to catch; and there are other instances of defective composition in the work.

XV.—*The Ghost of Junius; or the Authorship of the celebrated 'Letters'*, by this anonymous writer deduced from a letter, &c., addressed in 1775—6, by Lieut.-Gen. Sir Robert Rich, Bart., formerly Governor of Londonderry and Cullmore Fort, to the Rt. Hon. Lord Viscount Barrington, His Majesty's then Secretary-at-War. Illustrated with a genealogical chart, shewing the connection between Sir Robert Rich and several noble families. By FRANCIS AYERST. London: Thomas Bosworth, 1853.

Another attempt to trace the authorship of Junius' letters. How much of wit, labour, and acuteness have been brought to bear upon this most attractive mystery,—this choice puzzle for literary men! Mr. Ayerst has contributed his full quota of all three, to the amount. Beyond this we are really not competent to pronounce an opinion upon the subject.

XVI.—*A Help to Devotion*; or, a Collection of Novenas in Honour of God, and of His Blessed Saints. By the Very Rev. FATHER PAGANI. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

2. *Endologiae*; or, Interior Conversations with Jesus and Mary. From the Latin of the Ven. LOUIS BLOSIUS, With selections from the "Raccolta," &c. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1853.

The above little devotional works, recently issued from Derby, cannot be too highly recommended. The first, for which we are indebted to the respected Father Provincial of the Order of Charity, is sufficiently described by its title; and we need scarcely do more than observe, that the devotions themselves appear all that can be desired, and they are certainly very full and complete. The two first parts contain Novenas in preparation for the feasts of Jesus and Mary respectively, and are admirably calculated to assist the devotion of Catholics at these solemn seasons. In the third part, there are Novenas in honour of some fifty or sixty saints, including, of course, the more remarkable of the canonized children of the Church, and all those with whose names we are most familiar. The *Conversations with Jesus and Mary* are translated from the holy Abbot Blosius, who has long been a favourite author with English Catholics, and most deservedly so. There are, perhaps, no devotional works superior to his; and the selections in the present little volume (which we are glad to see published at so low a price) are especially characterized by that richness and fervour for which the works of the good abbot are so remarkable. There are also some valuable translations from the *Raccolta*, including the various "Crowns of our Lord," the famous Brigittine Rosary, and other highly indulged devotions. We should be glad to see this little manual circulated amongst our religious *poor* (as well as other classes), to whom, we think, it will be peculiarly acceptable: and its price makes it accessible to them.

XVII.—*Lazarine*; or, Duty once understood religiously fulfilled. London: Dolman, 1853.

This story is translated from the French; and without wishing to be critical we must say, that this is a circumstance which the style does not for a moment suffer the reader to forget. In itself the tale is sufficiently amusing,

full of incident, and of sound piety and good feeling. There is, however, that touch of exaggeration in the story, the sentiments and the style, which we have often found to be distasteful in French books of this class.

XVIII.—1. *Book of the Foundations.* Written by Saint Teresa. Translated from the Spanish, by the Rev. John Dalton. London : Jones, 1853.

2. *The Letters of Saint Teresa.* Translated from the Spanish by the Rev. John Dalton. London : T. Jones, 1853.

3. *The Interior Castle or Mansions.* Written by St. Teresa, (including some of her most interesting letters,) and translated from the Spanish, by the Rev. John Dalton. London : T. Jones, 1852.

Mr. Dalton has rendered an invaluable service to English Catholics by his admirable translation of these works ; they form, with the life of the saint, which the Oratorians have already published, a body of mystical theology, which the Church has termed divine, and of practical instruction which must be valuable to Christians of every class. It is not for us to dilate on the importance of that teaching so highly sanctioned, and so universally recognized ; but we must suggest to those who fear to be led too deeply into the realms of mysticism, that it is the perfect masters of a science who most safely and speedily initiate the learner even from the commencement. Religion is no exception to this rule, and St. Teresa, from the height to which she had attained, had the clearest insight into the state of souls, with a perfect method of directing them ; and the perceptions of her own inspired mind are conveyed with so much beauty, power, and tenderness, that they cannot but act strongly upon the hearts of her disciples. Thus much we must say for the spiritual uses of these books. But we think it not irrelevant to mention the great entertainment that may be derived from them. In the Book of the Foundations, the saint relates in her charming manner, and with the most graphic simplicity, the foundation of seventeen houses of her order, with the many curious and supernatural circumstances by which they were attended. She left this work to her spiritual children, who were hereafter to inhabit these houses, and for their sake she enriched it with beautiful anecdotes, and interesting particulars of their first inhabitants. St. Teresa's letters are highly spiritual, but they are diversified both by the char-

acters of those to whom she wrote, and her own mood of mind ; and their earnestness and sound sense irresistibly compel attention. We have already spoken of the "Life," in which the saint, telling her own story, would seem to lay open her whole heart to the reader. Of the "Interior Castle," it is obvious that we cannot speak properly in such a notice as this ; but we consider that we have done enough when we have drawn the attention of the Catholic public to the fact of these intellectual and spiritual treasures being now (for the first time) universally accessible.

XIX.—*A Visit to Mexico, by the West Indian Islands, Yucatan, and United States, with Adventures and Observations by the Way.* By WILLIAM PARISH ROBERTSON, author of "Letters on Paraguay." London : Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1853.

The title of this book raises greater expectations than the work fulfils ; it should, indeed have been called, "A diary of personal occurrences kept for the benefit of private friends." Only by such a title could the reader have been spared the disappointment he must feel, from the perusal of so very flimsy a sketch of the interesting countries he visited. Mr. Robertson undertook his mission to Mexico in consequence of his becoming a member of the Committee of Spanish American Bondholders ; he and his daughter set out upon their travels in August in 1848, and landed again in England in December 1849. Allowing for the delay of a tedious and dangerous voyage out, there was yet time to have seen and recorded much that was worth reading about ; but the travellers lived chiefly in the society of their countrymen, and even these are made mention of under their initials. It conveys no particular ideas, when we are told that on Saturday the 31st, "Messrs. M—, F—, and B— were dining with Sir I. L—," &c. ; or, "On Monday the 19th, we called on Mrs. and Miss C—, who may be called the female representatives of England in Mexico, for Mrs. J., our only other countrywoman at present, lives constantly at Tacubaya. Then we went to see our pleasant fellow-passengers, Mr. D— and his Chihuahua wife, residing with Mr. A—," &c. &c. ; and so on for evermore, and through all combinations of the alphabet. Often these important letters are prefaced with glowing ecomiums, more dictated by the wish to repay private civility than by a view to the information of the

public. When there is anything particular to be described, we are told that it has been often described before, that it is already well-known; at best, we have an extract from some other writer, chiefly "Mme. C— de la B.," to whom we are indebted for the liveliest passages, although there is not much even in these. Some pages upon the history and conditions of the mines, are borrowed from Mr. Ward's work upon "The Mines of Mexico," and here and there we have allusions to the moral condition of the inhabitants, which makes us eager for more information. Incidental remarks, there are, from which we may perceive a gentle and Catholic feeling amongst the people, as, for instance, "The miners—chiefly Italians—beginning the morning hymn as they descend in a long string, each with a candle stuck in front of his helmet-shaped hat, and singing it in chorus as they wind their way down to the dark caverns of their native earth." Visits to beautiful Indian villages, like Jilotipec, with its " prettily designed church and handsome spire," or Cuatepee, hidden in fruit and flowers, with its handsome church, and the "levy of chubby children, dashing forth from the parish school into the green, to gambol in the sunshine." The churches and religious festivals thronged everywhere, and by all ranks of people, evidently blending together in Catholic humility and good feeling: noble factories, and other public establishments conducted with far more humanity than any we have seen, especially the admirable Colegio de las Biscaynas; and the system of "ragged schools," which, without the obnoxious name, were established in Mexico long before we thought of them in this country. All these things, however slightly and casually mentioned, are caught at by the Catholic reader, who will desire with us to be better informed, by some observant Catholic traveller, of the present moral condition of the Mexican nation, and of that Indian population, which there alone thoroughly converted to the faith, and amalgamated with the conquering race, dwells with them in peace and harmony.

XX.—*Catholic Statistics*; 1823 to 1853. Richardson and Son, London, Dublin, and Derby.

The statistics of the Catholic Church in this country, *during the last thirty years*, cannot be otherwise than most interesting. This little publication is put forth by

authority, and we have no doubt, therefore, may be relied on for accuracy. The total *increase* of churches and chapels during the above period, is no less than 274; and since our bishops were multiplied in 1840, when the number of Vicars Apostolic was doubled, (a much shorter period than the above), the total increase of priests throughout England was no less than 288, a larger number than the increase of *Churches* during a period of more than twice that length. The total increase of Religious Houses since 1840 is 71, which is also a large increase for so short a period.

This little pamphlet contains also some interesting information as to the number of "Catholics in England in the reigns of James II. and William III., the latter of whom caused an official return to be made on the subject. There are also some particulars of the trial of Bishop Talbot, in the reign of George III, for saying Mass and administering the Sacraments, with the historical portions of the Pope's Apostolical Letters establishing the Hierarchy, and other interesting matter. The engravings of St. Mary's College, Oscott, the seat of the recent Council, are very pleasing. Any profits arising from the sale of the pamphlet will be given towards the purchase of furniture for the altars of Hammersmith Church, one of the best in the Metropolitan Diocese.

XXI.—*The Spaewife; or the Queen's Secret.* A Story of the reign of Elizabeth. By PAUL PEPPERGRASS, Esq. In two volumes. Baltimore: Murphy and Co. London: C. Dolman, 1853.

We must avow our conviction, that two volumes of more unmitigated and distasteful rubbish than these have seldom been printed. The "Queen's Secret" is the supposed birth of a baby of Queen Elizabeth's; and concerning the life or death of this child there is such brawling, scolding, and plotting betwixt the Queen and the spaewife,—the Queen always worsted,—as passes the limits of common sense. No disreputable waiting-woman in danger of being "turned off" for the loss of her character, ever matched the paltry vulgarity of Elizabeth in what Squeers would call "this here most uncommon fix." An utter triviality and falsehood of conception pervade every character introduced. The story is too absurd for comment, and the dialect too bad to escape without it. There are scarcely a

dozen pages of decent English in the book ; Irish and Scotch, stiff, stilted, and broad beyond all human utterance, alternate with each other, relieved by such Elizabethan English as may be constructed by turning every sentence wrong end foremost, and interspersing them all plentifully with such phrases as "Gadzooks," "S'death," "Minion," &c. &c., not to mention bad grammar, and a greater variety of downright oaths than we should at all like to exemplify.

XXII.—1. *Ancient History*, from the Dispersion of the Sons of Noe to the Battle of Actium, and Change of the Roman Republic into an Empire. Fifth Edition, revised, enlarged, and improved.

2. *Modern History*, from the coming of Christ and the change of the Roman Republic into an Empire to the Year of our Lord 1850. By PETER FREDET, D.D., Professor of History in St. Mary's College, Baltimore. Tenth Edition, enlarged and improved. London : Dolman, 1853.

Our readers will see that in these two volumes is contained the history of the whole world, from the days of Noe until within three years of our own period.

We know few more difficult amongst literary achievements than that of the compilation of a good, trustworthy, and readable Universal History ; none perhaps so useful as such a well extracted substance,—such a well defined chart or framework,—of a knowledge which all ought to possess. There are few who *need* know more of History than is contained in these two volumes ; being possessed of so much, every one, according to his want and ability, may fill up portions of this world-wide picture ; finish it up to the minutest point of truth and accuracy ; embellish it with all the stores of research and wisdom which seem to gather naturally about this cardinal science of History. We can recommend Mr. Fredet's work, as fulfilling all the requisite conditions in a book of this kind. The histories are not broken up into separate portions, but skilfully connected into continuous narrative ; neither has the author confined himself to a dry chronicle of facts, the governments, heroes, and characteristics of each age and country are touched upon with spirit. The chronological tables of contemporary sovereigns, and of memorable events and the personages, and the notes and lists of authorities are all carefully arranged, for enabling the student to fix the contents of the book upon his memory.

Finally, and what is of most importance, this history, compiled by a learned and conscientious Catholic, may be relied upon for truth. If we were to find a fault, we should say that too little pains had been given to investigating the specious gloss which has been thrown over the civilization of antiquity; but the events of modern history, so far as we can judge upon a cursory inspection, are fairly stated, without undue bias in respect to country or creed.

XXIII.—*The Lenten Manual and Companion for Passion Week and Holy Week*, translated and compiled from various sources, by the RIGHT REV. DR. WALSH, Bishop of Halifax. Dunigan and Brothers, 1851.

This little work is divided into three parts, the first consists of appropriate prayers for Stations to be held at the commencement of Lent, to the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, Our Blessed Lady, the Angels and the Saints. The second part is a commentary upon the prophecies of Jeremiah, especially those portions which are read in Holy Week. The third—of prayers and devotions for the Via Crucis. These excellent devotions are prefaced by Dr. Walsh's Lenten Pastoral, and concluded by instructions upon the observance of the Jubilee by the same devout and eloquent prelate.

INDEX TO VOLUME THIRTY-FIVE.

Abray, M., his testimony in Libri's case, 21.
Academie des Sciences, 7.
Acte of accusation against Libri, 19, 26, 47, 52, 57, 62, 65.
Affai Arabs, the, 135.
Anchorit 4, Essonian, 144.
Arcade of the "Ecce Homo," 163.
Arbogast, his collection of MSS., 54.
Archive-chamber of Nineveh, 122.
Archives of the Institute plundered and dispersed, 50—particulars and dates of some of these sales, 52.
Arundel, Archbishop, 407, 416.
Athenaeum, the, its mention of the Chinese rebels, 225.
Babylon, ancient, its site, 132.
Bail, the rebel, 417.
Baptism, ceremonies of, 378.
Beit-el-Rerm ruin described by M. de Sauley, 152.
Bethlehem, 143.
Bible, the, 293—texts from, 295—its insufficiency as a rule of faith, 297—practically slighted by Protestants, 300—its inaccessibility to the Church in the first centuries, 304—no evidence to be found in it of the true Canon of Scripture, ib.—or the accuracy of the translation, 309—and no security for the right interpretation, 310—gives no summary of fundamental doctrines, 313—mystical interpretation of, 317—Wycliffe's translation of, 418—indiscriminate reading of, 419.
Bibliothèque Nationale, its directors consider M. Libri as an enemy, 27—corrupt practices and plunder going on in it, 31, 39—treatment in it of the Dupuy collection, 34—immense losses from its collection, 40.
Birs Nimroud, 134.
Bishop of Jelu, 108—of the middle ages, 407.
Bitlis, town of, 102.
Blood, Feast of the Most Precious, 366.
Board of Education, its discussion concerning the reading certain books, 236—resolutions they adopted, ib.—withdraw two of the books, 237—its original rule, 238—required to be unanimous in religious matters, 242—their conduct to the patrons of schools and guardians of pupils, 243—*do not insist* on the reading of certain books in any of the National schools, 247—boards never infallible in their working, 258.
Book, Catholic, Society, their works selected by the educational board, 241.
Books proceeding from public establishments—found in all collections, 28—instances of this, 29—supposed to be stolen from the **Mazarin Library**, 62—*notices* of, 266.
Booksellers at Paris afraid to give copies of their accounts with M. Libri, 57.
Boris, Tzar of Russia—his character, and acquisition of the sovereignty of the empire, 499.
Boudy, M., his charge against Libri, 11—his ex parte report published in all the papers, 16.
Brougham, Lord, his opinion of the charges against Libri, 11.
Bunzen, Mr., fails to prove Hippolytus the author of *Philosophumena*, 450.
Callistus, anecdote of, 455—nature of the charges brought against, 472—sketch of his career, 476—his episcopate, 478.
personal history of prior to his pontificate 479.
Charges against his ecclesiastical rule, 481.
Canal of the Naharman, 131.
Canon of Scripture, 366.
Carlile, Rev. Dr., his letter upon the education question, 240, 242, 257.
Catholics, their treatment by the daily press, 205—compelled to pay rates, and hear prayers at funerals which they disapprove, 222—Catholics in China, their present sufferings, 226—hold no local decision to be final, 259—their duties with respect to education in Ireland, 264.
charitable in their judgment of those who profess heresy, 312.
Ceremonies of the Catholic Church, 363—in general not gorgeous, 366—of the essence of her constitution, 369—safeguards of regularity, 370—their great object to protect the B. Sacrament, 371—of the Mass, 372—safeguards of the Sacraments, 374, 377—their bearing upon dogma, 375—the very language of mystery, 376—meaningless in the Established Church, 377—promote uniformity and conformity, 381.
Chabaille, M., omitted from commission for examining M. Libri's papers, 16.
Chaucer, 306, 420.
China, rebellion there, 223.
Christians, Nestorian, persecuted by the Turks, 104—by the Protestant missionaries, 105—stand in real need of protection, 137—under Turkish rule, 98, 99, 103.

Church, Catholic, its internal organization suffices for reform, 280—is the body of Christ, 281—in it man inherits collective treasures, 283—the very idea of a Church rendering distasteful that of private judgment, 285—in what way she regards the Bible, 293—steadfastness in her sacred rites, 364—persecutions inflicted upon her under the reigns of the Edwards, 391, 392, 393, 395.
College of Juilly, 348.
Colleges, Queen's, in Ireland, 338.
Commissioners (in the case against Libri), their ignorance, 60.
Communion of saints, what it is to each individual, 283.
Conte, Francois, his depositions concerning Libri's papers, 17.
Courtney, Bishop, 407, 408.
Creed, Apostles', deductions from, 314.

Dagon, representation of him, 120.
Dale, Mr., his work on ceremonial, 380.
Damascus, 170.
Deism, 336, 337, 340—dries up the spirit of benevolence, 342—void left by it in the human soul, 354.
Deists, 344—contrast between their prayers and those of Christians, 356.
Demetrius the Impostor, 492—first disclosure of his pretensions, 502—his first entry into Moscow, 505—his conduct after his enthusiastic reception, 506—his marriage with the Princess Marina Misnec, 508—termination of his extraordinary career, 509.
De Prescriptionibus Hæreticorum, 454.
Divorce, the law of, 298.
Dollinger, Dr., his Hippolytus and Callistus, 450, 462, 467.
Droz, M., his early lapse into infidelity, 345—his conversion, 350—extracts from his works, 350, 355.

Education, National, in Ireland, modification of the first scheme, 240.
Edward I, King, plunders the clergy, 391—prevents appeal to Rome, ib.—state to which the Church was brought by him, 392.
Egypt, 87.
Emperor of Russia, 77.
Eucharist, Sacrament of the Blessed, how held in the Church of England, 379.
Ezroom, 95.

Faith, the rule of, 287—that adopted by the Hebrews, 289—insufficiency of that of the Protestants, 297—that of private judgment always equivocal, 320—and hinders the propagation of the faith, 321—should be secure, 322—a guide to ordinances as well as doctrines, ib.—favourable to the development of virtue, 323.—inclusive in its nature, 325—in losing certainty loses its essential character, 325—requires the exercise of certain virtues, 327.—relations between it and reason, 361.
Fish, whether they live in the Dead Sea, 120.
France, the true protector of Christian interests in Palestine, 73—in all former times, 79—her fatal policy in the time of Richelieu, 84—impiety of her alliance with Turkey, 86—her proper policy, according to Leibnitz, 87.
Franciscans, monks, at the Holy Sepulchre, 80.
Friars, mendicant, 398, 399—their fidelity to the Church, 400.
Funeral ceremonies of Protestants in Spain, 1, 221.

Galileo, anecdote of his manuscripts, 59.
Gullitza, Princess de, mode of her conversion
 349.
Geomyomachia, 64—in M. Libri's possession in 1824, 66.
Gerizim, temple of, 165.
Gieseler, Dr., critic concerning Hippolytus, 471.
Glass found in the ruins of Nineveh, 129.
God, man's knowledge of Him, 383.
Government, Turkish, its effect on the countries subject to it, 95, 98, 103, 113, 136—the Christians are not protected by it, ib.—instances of its oppression, 104—and misgovernment, 130.
Grosteke, Bishop, 389—patronizes the Friars 398.
Guisot, M., his evidence in M. Libri's case, 24.

Henry II, King, his controversy with Thomas a Becket, 386.
Henry III, King, murder committed in his time, 390.
Henry IV of France, 83.
Hierarchy, Catholic, its establishment in Holland, 212.
Hippolytus, his treatise against heresy, 452—supposed to have resisted Zephyrinus and Callistus, 458—doubts concerning his history, 463.
Holy Places, the, interest felt in them by Christians, 74.

Inscriptions found in Mr. Layard's excavations, 117—in the Archive-chambers of Nineveh, 122.
Insurgents, Chinese, their religious condition, 224—persecution of Catholics, 225.
Ivan III. of Russia, his character, 498.

Jehu, son of Omri, 118.
John of Gaunt, 404, 408.
Jubinal, M. Achille, 26, 31—further results of his researches in the Bibliothèque, 37.
Judgment, private, 278—its exercise in religious matters injurious to the soul, 329.

Kaimil Pasha, anecdote of, 113.
Kelath, ruin of the city, 100.
Kouyunjik, 113.
Kurds, the, 100.

Lamporechi, M., his protest against the unfairness of M. Libri's trial, 18.
Law of England, 173—in its criminal division, ib.—its cruelty moderated by the Church, 174—since the decay of that influence extremely cruel, 176—at variance with the Church in not allowing penitent restitution, ib.—laws respecting fraud, 177—could not be acted on by a priest, 178—distinction between civil and criminal, 179—is often doubtful, 181—its faultiness in cases of seduction and slander, 185—law of the Church on these points, 186—instances of its inconsistency in cases of defamation, 188—another instance, 190—English law unable to deal with questions of moral duty, 191—instanciated in cases between debtor and creditor, 193—how such cases would be dealt with by confessors, 195.
— Hebrew, no provision made for circulating it, 289—successively added to, 290.
Layard, Austin H., his work, 93—embarks upon his journey, 94—his bitter anti-Catholicism, 106—his intercourse with the worshippers of the devil, 110—meets his old friends, 112—his

excavations, 114—discovery of the Archive chamber, 122—difficulties in getting to Babylon, 132—his excavations there, 133—his visit to the Affa Arabs, 135.

Le Bas, Mr., upon porphyry, 385.

Lepelle, M., his pamphlet concerning the losses of the Bibliothèque Nationale, 39.

Lewis, St., his supposed advice to Catholics, 417, —XVI., details of his murder, 441.

Libraries, Mazarin, 62.

Libri, M., prosecution against him, 2—his birth and earlier career, 4—his *Histoire des Sciences Mathématiques*, 5—his religious views, 6—estimation of him in France, 7—his war with the Ecole des chartes, ib.—attack on M. Arago, 8—attacks the Catholic party, 9—anonymous charges against him, 10—his conduct therupon, 12—attacks upon him in the newspapers, 14—his books and papers seized, 16—informally treated, 17—suppressions of evidence in his favour, 22, 24—his offer to present his collection to the Bibliothèque Royale, 23—is selected as a victim to screen the maladministration of the establishment, 45—is charged with selling academical reports, 47—disproved, 49—conduct of the commission in his chambers, ib.—his possession of Arbogast's manuscripts, 54—charge of “inexplicable detention,” 49, 55—charged with being too poor to have bought his library, 56—details of his purchases, 58—general state of the case, 66.

Lion, anecdote of, 137.

Liturgeries of the Church, 375.

Lollards, rebellion of, how treated by historians, 425—reasons for their condemnation, 435.

Luther and his compeers approved by the Sultan, 86.

Mac Mahon, Dr., his escape, 443.

Mahmoud, Sultan, effect of his reforms, 95.

Mahomedanism, its absolute antagonism to Christianity, 137—compared with Deism, 343.

Mar Shamoun, patriarch of the Nestorians, 107.

Marriages, mixed, 339.

Masada, the ancient, 150.

Mass, the service of, 367, 372.

Mathematicians, French, 5.

Merimee, M., his defence of M. Libri, 4—M., his work on Demetrius the Impostor, 492.

Missionaries, Protestant, obliged always to discard the rule of private judgment, 321.

Model-School on Clonmel, 245.

Model-Schools under the Board of Education, 244—not to be considered merely normal, 248—no distinction to be made between them and other schools, ib.

Naudet, M., Director of the Bibliothèque Nationale, his ignorance concerning its great losses, 41—negligence of the work entrusted to him of making a catalogue, 42—his inability to control its management, ib.—attack upon his colleagues, 44.

Negotiations between France, Russia, and Turkey, 70, 76.

Nimrod, traditions of, 101—his palace, 134.

Niniveh, ruins of, 93—bas-reliefs upon its walls 123.—relics found in the rubbish of, 127.

Novatian, 468.

Order accompanies always the action of the Holy Spirit, 371.

O'Reilly, Surgeon, anecdote of, 445.

Osman, Sultan, his proclamation, 81.

Palmer, Mr., 378.

Peter, St., change in his name, 300—texts proving his supremacy, ib.

Peter's pence, 388.

Philosophumena, the, 448.—authorship of, 449, 470.

Philosophy, defects in the inculcation of, 346.

Politics, revolutionary school of, unfavourable to Catholicism, 339.

Pope Pius V., his letter to Charles IX., 85.—Plus IX., no truth in the assertion that he was to visit France, 211.

Popes, their right of provision to English benefices, 388, 394.—beg assistance from the English Catholics, and are refused, 389.

Ponjoulat, M., his work on *La France et la Russie à Constantinople*, 73, 79, 82.

Press, the account of the Pope's being to crown the Emperor, 210—suppresses all notice of the persecution of Catholics, 211—its misstatements as to the Dutch Hierarchy, 212—hackneyed axioms by which its attacks are prefaced, 218—comparison of its notices of the Roman and Birmingham prisons, 219—insults to Spain on account of the refusal of funeral ceremonies, 221—silent on the prohibition of Catholic processions here, ib.—absurd accounts of the Chinese rebellion, 223—infidel press increasing in talent, 337.

Priesthood, Jewish, its privileges, 290.

Prisons, the horrors of those in England, 219.

Processions, Catholic, forbidden in England, 221—with more illiberality than is used in Spain, ib.

Protestants end in making religion a matter of taste, 324.—can never agree as to fundamental doctrines, 313—give ever the narrowest and most superficial explanations of Holy Writ, 316—dealing only with the surface, 317—dare not venture on mystical interpretation, ib.—compared to the Sadducees, 292—texts they adduce for reading the Bible, 294—neglect others in the contrary sense, 296.

Protestantism, 224—its aids and resources, 274—has no Theology, 275—wastes what it has received, ib.—doctrine unable to grow in it or even to live, 277—why it fails in witnessing for the truth, ib.—its rule of private judgment, 278—gradually declining into unbelief, 338.

Queen's colleges in Ireland, 338.

Ravenel, M., his acknowledgment that a book had been refused by the Bibliothèque Nationale to a supporter of M. Libri, 27.

Rebellion in China, its religious character, 224.

Religion, sublime functions formerly attributed to it, 277—cannot abdicate that of witnessing the truth, ib.—Mahomedan, 343.—when true, the only consoler of old age, 360.

Roads in Syria, 95.

Roche, Mr., 439.

Rose of Jericho, 159.

Russia, growth of her power, 79—how injurious to Europe, 83—her destiny, according to La-cordaire, 90.

Russian History, slight sketch of, 493.

Sacrifice, Eucharistic, 299.

Salinis, Mgr. de, 348.
Saulcy, Mr. F. de, his Journey round the Red Sea, 139—extract, 147—his description of Sebbeh on the east coast, 149—describes Beit-el-Rerm, 152—and the ruins of Sodom, 157—describes a storm over it, ib.—the antiquities of Jerusalem, 161—the arcade of the "Ecce Homo," 163—temple of Gerizim, 165—Damascus, 170.

Schools, the model, 244.

Scriptures, Protestant version of, 108.

Sea, the Dead, 139—approaches to it, 144—its first appearance, 145—its water, 146—its fruits, 148—vegetable life, 159.

Sebbeh, the ancient Masada, 149.

Sennacherib, records of his reign, 117—representations of him in bas-relief, 126.

Simon de Sudbury, 407—his murder, 417.

Sin, original, 353.

Sinclair, Miss, her detestation of ascetic characters, 201—untruth of her novels, 202.

Sodom, city of, its site, 155.

Soliman, Sultan, his opinion of Luther, 86.

Stamps upon books, 20.

Swinderby, William, 416.

Tae-ping, 223.

Tekrit, city of, 129.

Tertullian, his work, 454.

Thaumaturge, 233.

Theist, the modern, 343.

Thorpe, Chief Justice, 413.

Threshing-floor, 99.

Throne found in the ruins of Nineveh, 129.

Tien-ta, 223.

Tottenham, Mr., his letters to the Board of Education, 244.

Truth, method to be pursued in enquiry for 286.

Unity, an organic law of the Church, 300.

Vaughan, Dr., biographer of Wycliffe, 437.

Viviani, fate of his collection of Galileo's relics, 59.

Whately, Dr., his discourse upon Infallibility, 230—has now discovered its true seat, ib.—his controversy with his colleagues in the Board of Education, 232—stands alone in the question, ib.—his fallacies in argument, 232, 249—his "dismissal," 236—his memorandum concerning the Clonmel model school, 235—absents himself from the discussions of the Board, 236—his books withdrawn, 237—two points at issue between him and the Board, 239—protests against the permission to discontinue the use of books disapproved of, 245—suffers no book to be withdrawn that has once been sanctioned, 256—his subsequent heresies condemning his previous works, 260.

Women of Damascus, their ornaments, 170.

Wordsworth, Dr., his work on Hippolytus, 450—extract from, 452—his polemics, 455, 456—founded upon false assumptions, 459—concludes Hippolytus invariably right, 472.

Worship, divine, of Catholics, its solemnity, 358.

Wycliffe, 382—republication of his works, 383—idea entertained of him by Protestants, 384—co-operator with Chaucer, 396—his prophecies, 397—charges against the clergy, ib.—especial jealousy of the Friars, 400, 401—always took the part of the strong, 402—pursuit of his own interest, ib.—seeks the Wardenship of Catherine's Hall, ib.—His appeal to Rome, 404—is made commissioner to support the King's claims, 406—calls the Pope Antichrist, 410—is cited before the Papal commissioners, 410—his evocations, ib.—was the occasion of the rebellion of 1381, 414—his preachers, 415—his translation of the Bible, 418—his inconsistencies, 422—avarice, 425—carries on his heresies till they are condemned, 427—gives way instantly, 428—continues to administer the Sacraments he had denied, 429—his death, 434—his followers, 435—his biographers, 436.

Yezidi worshippers of the devil, 109.

Fazuf, Priest of the Yezidi, 109.

Zephyrinus, Bishop, 457.



